Magistri Petri Lombardi
Arch. Episc. Parisiensis

Sententiarum Quatuor Libri

LIBER PRIMUS SENTENTIARUM.

DE DEI UNITATE ET TRINITATE
DISTINCTIO X.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 192-193.
Cum Notitiis Editorum Quaracchi

Master Peter Lombard
Archbishop of Paris

The Four Books of Sentences

THE FIRST BOOK OF THE SENTENCES

ON THE UNITY AND TRINITY OF GOD
DISTINCTION 10

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 192-193.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Cap. I.

De Spiritu sancto, quod amor Patris et Filii proprie dicitur, cum sit in Trinitate amor, qui est Trinitas, sicut Verbum proprie dicitur sapientia, et tamen tota Trinitas dicitur sapientia.

Chapter I

On the Holy Spirit, that He is properly said to be the Love of the Father and of the Son, though there is in the Trinity a Love, which is the Trinity, just as the Word is properly said to be Wisdom, and, nevertheless, the whole Trinity is said to be Wisdom.

Nunc post Filii aeternitatem de Spiritu sancto, quantum Deo donante videre conceditur, disseramus. Spiritus sanctus amor est sive caritas sive dilectio Patris et Filii. Unde Augustinus in decimo quinto libro de Trinitate[1] ait: « Spiritus sanctus nec Patris est solius nec Filii est solius, sed amborum, et ideo communem qua invicem se diligunt Pater et Filius nobis insinuat caritatem ».

Now after the eternity of the Son let us speak in an orderly manner [disseramus] of the Holy Spirit, as much as, with God giving, one is granted to see Him [videre conceditur]. The Holy Spirit is the love [amor] or charity or dilection of the Father and of the Son. Whence (St.) Augustine in the fifteenth book of On the Trinity[1] says: « The Holy Spirit is neither of the Father alone nor is He of the Son alone, but of both, and for that reason He insinuates to us the common charity by which the Father and the Son love one another ».

Ioannes autem in Epistola canonica[2] ait: *Deus caritas est*. « Non dixit: Spiritus sanctus caritas est; quod si dixisset, absolutior esset sermo, et non parva pars quaestionis decisa; sed quia dixit: *Deus caritas est*, incertum est, et ideo quaerendum,[3] utrum Deus Pater sit caritas, an Filius, an Spiritus sanctus, an Deus ipsa Trinitas, quia est ipsa non tres dii, sed unus est Deus ». Ad quod Augustinus in eodem libro ita dicit: « Nescio, cur, sicut sapientia

Moreover (St.) John in (his) canonical Epistle[2] says: *God is charity*. « He does not say: the Holy Spirit is charity; which if he had said, more absolute would (his) speech be, and not a little free from questioning [non parva pars quaestionis decisa]; but because he said: *God is charity*, it is uncertain, and for that reason it must be asked,[3] whether God the Father is charity, or whether the Son, or whether the Holy Spirit, or whether God the Trinity Itself,

et Pater dicitur et Filius et Spiritus sanctus, et simul omnes non tres, sed una sapientia, non ita et caritas dicatur Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctua, et[4] simul omnes una caritas. Non ideo tamen quisquam nos inconvenienter aetimet caritatem appellare Spiritum sanctum, quia et Deus Pater et Deus Filius potest caritas nuncupari, sicut proprie Verbum Dei etiam sapientia Dei dicitur, cum et Pater et Spiritus sanctus sit sapientia ».

because It Itself is not three gods, but God is one ». To which (St.) Augustine in the same book thus says: « I do not know, why, just as wisdom is said (to be) both the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and All together [simul omnes] not three, but one Wisdom, charity is not thus also said (to be) the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and[4] All together one Charity. Not for that reason, however, does anyone consider [aestimet] that we unfittingly [inconvenienter] name the Holy Spirit Charity, because God the Father and God the Son can be named [nuncupari] Charity, just as properly the Word of God is also said (to be) the Wisdom of God, though Wisdom is also the Father and the Holy Spirit ».

« Si ergo proprie aliquis horum trium caritas nuncupari debet, quis aptius quam Spiritus sanctus? ut scilicet in[5] illa summa simplicique natura non sit aliud substantia, et aliud caritas, sed substantia ipsa sit caritas, et caritas ipsa sit substantia, sive in Patre sive in Filio sive in Spirtu sancto, et tamen Spiritus sanctus proprie caritas nuncupetur ». Ecce his verbis aperte ostendit[6] Augustinus, quod in Trinitate caritas aliquanto refertur ad substantiam, quae communis est trium personarum et tota in singulis, aliquando specialiter ad personam Spiritus sancti; sicut sapientia Dei aliquando pro substantia divina, aliquando pro Filio proprie accipitur; et hoc in multis fieri reperitur.

« If, therefore, properly anyone of these three ought to be named [nuncupari] Charity, who more aptly than the Holy Spirit? so that, namely, in[5] that most high and simple Nature one thing [aliud] is not the Substance, and another the Nature, but the Substance itself be Charity, and Charity itself be the Substance, whether in the Father or in the Son or in the Holy Spirit, and, nevertheless, the Holy Spirit properly be named [nuncupetur] Charity ». Behold with these words (St.) Augustine openly shows[6], that in the Trinity Charity is sometimes referred to the Substance, which is the common (property) of the three Persons and whole in each [tota in singulis], sometimes specially to the Person of the Holy Spirit; just as the Wisdom of God is sometimes accepted for the Divine Substance, sometimes properly for the Son; and this is found to occur in many (attributes).

Cap. II.

Quod eadem nomina proprie et univeraliter accipiuntur.

« Pluribus enim exemplis doceri potest, multa rerum vocabula et universaliter poni, et proprie quibusdam rebus adhiveri, sicut Legis nomine aliquando simul omnia veteris Instrumenti[7] significantur eloquia, aliquando autem proprie vocatur Lex, quae data est

Chapter II

That the same names are properly and universally accepted.

« For by more examples one can be taught, that many terms [vocabula] of things are also posited universally, and are properly employed for certain things, just as by the name of the Law there are sometimes simultaneously signified all the passages

per Moysen ». « Multa alia suppetunt exempla, sed in re aperta vitanda est longitudo sermonis. Sicut ergo unicum Dei Verbum proprie vocamus nomine sapientiae, cum sit universaliter et Spiritus sanctus et Pater ipsa sapientia; ita Spiritus sanctus proprie nuncupatur vocabulo *caritatis*,[8] cum sit et Pater et Filius universaliter caritas.

[eloquia] of the old Instrument,[7] but sometimes the Law, which has been given through Moses, is called (this) in a proper manner ». « Many other examples are at hand [suppetunt], but in an open matter [in re aperta] length of speech is to be avoided. Therefore, just as we call the unique Word of God by the name of Wisdom, though universally Wisdom Itself is also the Holy Spirit and the Father; so the Holy Spirit is properly named [nuncupatur] with the term of *charity*,[8] though universally Charity is also the Father and the Son. »

« Sed Dei Verbum, id est unigenitus Dei Filius, aperte dictus est Dei sapientia ore Apostoli dicentis[9] *Christum Dei virtutem et Dei sapientiam*, Spiritus autem sanctus ubi sit dictus caritas, invenimus, si diligenter Ioannis Apostoli eloquium[10] scrutemur, qui cum dixisset: *Diligamus invicem, quia dilectio ex Deo est*, adiunxit: *Et omnis, qui diligat, ex Deo natus est, quia Deus dilectio est*. Hic manifestavit se dixisse, eam dilectionem esse Deum, quam dixit ex Deo. Deus ergo ex Deo est dilectio; sed quia et Filius ex Deo Patre natus est, et Spiritus sanctus ex Deo Patre prodecit, quem potius eorum hic debeamus accipere dictum esse dilectionem, merito quaeritur. Pater enim solus ita Deus / est, . . .

« But the Word of God, that is the only-begotten Son of God, openly is said to be the wisdom of God by the mouth of the Apostle saying[9] *Christ the virtue of God and the wisdom of God*, but we shall find where the Holy Spirit is said to be Charity, if we diligently scrutinize the passage [eloquium][10] of the Apostle John, where after he had said: *Let us love* [diligamus] *one another, because love* [dilectio] *is of God* [ex Deo est], he added: *And everyone, who loves,* [diligat] *has been born of God,* [ex Deo natus] *because God is love* [dilectio]. Here he has manifested that he had said, that God is the love, which he said (is) of God. Therefore the God of God is love [Deus ex Deo est dilectio]; but because both the Son is born of [ex] God the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeds from [ex] God the Father, whom of these we ought rather here to accept to be said to be love, is rightly asked. For the Father alone is God thus, . . .

[1] Cap. 17. n. 27. et 28. — In princip. dist. post *Nunc* codd. D E addunt *vero*.
[2] I. Ioan. 4, 6. — Omnia, quae sequuntur in hoc cap., excepta sunt ex Augustino, loc. cit. n. 27-31.
[3] Edd. cum cod. A addunt *est*. Deinde ante *Augustinus* Vat. et ed. 4 ponunt *hoc* pro *quod*.
[4] Vat. et ed. 4 omittunt *et*. — Infra ante *Filius* cod. C et ed. 8 omittunt *Deus*; in fine huius textus ante *sapientia* codd. B C D et edd. 1, 8 *sint* pro *sit*. [5] Vat. perperam omittit *in*. In fine huius textus Vat. et pleraeque edd. *nuncupatur* pro *nuncupetur*, refragantibus Augustino, codd. A C E et ed. 8.
[6] Vat. *dicit*, contradicentibus mss. et edd. 1, 8. Mox solae edd. 1, 8 adiiciunt *est* post *tota*.
[7] Vat. cum edd. 1, 4, 6, 8 *Testamenti*, sed omnes codd. ceteraeque edd. cum originali contradicunt. [Tr. — Paulo infra in ed. criticali post » deest novum «.]
[8] Vat. cum omnibus edd., excepta 1, contra codd. et

[1] Chapter 17, nn. 27 and 28. — At the beginning of the distinction after *Now* codices D and E add *however* [vero].
[2] 1 John 4:6. — All, which follows in this chapter, has been excerpted out of (St.) Augustine, loc. cit.,, nn. 27-31.
[3] The Editions together with codex A add the *must* [est]. Then before *(St.) Augustine* [Augustinus] the Vatican text and edition 4 put *this* [hoc] for *which* [quod].
[4] The Vatican text and edition 4 omit *and* [et]. — Below before *the Son* [Filius] codex C and edition 8 omit *God* [Deus]; at the end of this text codics B C D and edition 1 and 8 read *though both the Father and the Holy Spirit are Wisdom* [et Pater et Spiritus Sanctus sint sapientia].
[5] The Vatican text faultily omits *in* [in]. At the end of this text the Vatican text and very many editions has *is named* [nuncupatur] for *be named* [nuncupetur], in

originale *proprio vocabulo caritas*. Deinde Vat. ceteraeque edd. exceptis 1, 8, contra codd. B D E omittunt *et* ante *Pater*.
[9] I. Cor. 1, 24.
[10] I. Ioan. 4, 7. Vulgata: *quia caritas ex Deo est . . . Deus caritas est*.

disagreement with (St.) Augustine and codices A C E and edition 8.
[6] The Vatican text reads *says* [dicit], against the manuscripts and editions 1 and 8. Then only editions 1 and 8 ad *is* [est] before *whole in each* [tota in singulis].
[7] The Vatican text together with editions 1, 4, 6, and 8 reads *Testament* [Testamenti], but all the codices and the rest of the editions together with the original contradict this. [Tr. Note: A little below this the critical edition after » there is lacking the new «.]
[8] The Vatican text together with all the editions, except edition 1, against the codices and the original, read *with the proper term charity* [proprio vocabulo caritas]. Then the Vatican text and the rest of the editions, except ed. 1 and 8, against codices B D and E, omit *also* [et] before *the Father* [Pater].
[9] 1 Cor. 1:24.
[10] 1 Jn. 4:7. The Vulgate reads: *because charity is from God . . . God is charity* [quia cartias ex Deo est . . . Deus caritas est].

---

est, ut non sit ex Deo; et ideo dilectio, quae ita Deus est, ut ex Deo sit, non ipse Pater est, sed aut Filius, aut Spiritus Sanctus. Sed in consequentibus cum Dei dilectionem commemorasset Ioannes,[1] qua *dilexit nos*, et hinc hortatus esset, ut et *nos invicem diligamus* atque ita *Deus in nobis maneat*, quia utique dilectionem Deum dixerat, statim, volens de hac re apertius aliquid eloqui, inquit: *In hoc cognoscimus, quia in ipso manemus, et ipse in nobis, quia de spiritu suo dedit nobis*. Spiritus itaque sanctus, de quo dedit nobis, facit nos in Deo manere, et ipsum in nobis. Hoc autem facit dilectio. Ipse igitur est Deus dilectio.[2] Deus igitur Spiritus sanctus, qui procedit ex Deo, significatur ubi legitur: *Deus dilectio est*, et *dilectio ex Deo est*. »[3] Ecce his verbis aperte dicit Augustinus, Spiritum sanctum esse caritatem Patris et Filii; et in tantum quoque sermonem produxit, ut videatur dixisse, Spiritum sanctum non solum esse dilectionem Patris et Filii, qua se invicem et nos diligunt, sed etiam dilectionem, qua diligimus Deum. Sed utrum ipse sit caritas, qua nos diligimus Deum, in sequenti explicabitur.[4]

that He is not of God [ex Deo]; and for that reason the love [dilectio], which is thus God, to be of God [ex Deo], is not the Father Himself, but either the Son, or the Holy Spirit. But in what follows [in consequentibus], since (St.) John had recalled [commemorasset] the love of God,[1] with which He *had loved us*, and his had exhorted, both that *we love one another*, and thus that *God remain in us*, because he had indeed said that love [dilectionem] is God, immediately, wanting to say something more openly about this matter, said: *In this we recognize, that we remain in Him, and He in us, because He has given us of his spirit*. And thus the Holy Spirit, of whom He has given us, causes [facit] us to remain in God, and Him in us. But love [dilectionem] does this. Therefore God Himself is love [dilectio].[2] Therefore God the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from God [ex Deo], is signified here where there is written: *God is love*, and *love is of God*. »[3] Behold with these words (St.) Augustine openly says, that the Holy Spirit is the charity of the Father and of the Son; and inasmuch as He also brings forth speech, as he seems to have said, the Holy Spirit is not only the love [dilectionem] of the Father and of the Son, by which They love one

another and us, but also the love [dilectionem], by which we love [diligimus] God. But whether He be the charity, by which we love God, shall be explained in the following.[4]

Nunc vero quod incepimus ostendere curemus, scilicet Spiritum sanctum dilectionem esse sive amorem Patris et Filii, quo scilicet Pater diligit Filium et Filius Patrem. De hoc Hieronymus super decimum septimum Psalmum[5] ait: « Spiritus sanctus nec Pater est nec Filius, sed dilectio, quam habet Pater in Filium et Filius in Patrem. » Augustinus quoque in sexto libro de Trinitate[6] ait: « In omnibus aequalis est Patri Filius et est unius eiusdemque substantiae. Quapropter etiam Spiritus sanctus in eadem unitate substantiae et aequalitate consistit ».

Now, however, let us take up [curemus] what we began to show, namely that the Holy Spirit is the dilection or love of the Father and of the Son, by which namely the Father loves [diliget] the Son and the Son the Father. Of this (St.) Jerome on the seventeenth Psalm[5] says: « The Holy Spirit is neither the Father nor the Son, but the love [dilectionem], which the Father has unto [in] the Son and the Son unto the Father » (St.) Augustine also in the sixth book of <u>On the Trinity</u>[6] says: « In all (things) the Son is equal to the Father and is of one and the same substance (as the Father). For which reason the Holy Spirit too consists in the same unity and equality of substance. »

« Sive enim sit unitas amborum, sive sanctitas, sive caritas, manifestum est, quod non aliquis duorum est quo uterque coniungitur, quo genitus a gignente diligatur genitoremque suum diligat, sintque non particpatione, sed essentia sua, neque dono superioris alicuius, sed suo proprio *servantes unitatem spiritus in vinculo pacis* ».[7] Ecce hic habes Spiritus sanctum esse quo Filius diligitur a Patre et Pater a Filio, et quo illi duo *servant unitatem pacis*. « Spiritus ergo sanctus, ut ait Augustinus in eodem, commune est aliquid Patris et Filii, quidquid illud est. At ipsa communio consubstantialis et coaeterna est, quae si amicitia convenienter dici potest, dicatur, sed aptius dicitur caritas; et haec quoque substantia, quia Deus substantia est, et *Deus caritas est*.[8] Tria ergo sunt et non amplius: unus diligens eum qui de illo est, et unus diligens eum de quo est, et ipsa dilectio, quae si nihil est, quomodo Deus dilectio est? Si non est substantia, quomodo Deus substantia est? »

« For whether He is the unity of both, or the sanctity, or the charity, it is manifest, that One belonging to Two is not that by which Both are conjoined, by which the One begotten be loved by the One begetting and love His own Begetter, and They be not by participation, but by Their own Essence, nor by the superior gift of another, but by Their own *preserving* [servantes] *the unity of spirit in the chain of peace* ».[7] Behold here we have that the Holy Spirit is that by which the Son is loved by the Father and the Father by the Son, and that by which those Two *preserve the unity of peace*. « Therefore the Holy Spirit, as (St.) Augustine says in the same (passage), is something common belonging to the Father and the Son, whatever He is. But that communion is consubstantial and coeternal, which if it can conveniently be said (to be) friendship, let it be (so) called, but is more aptly said (to be) charity; and this (is) also the Substance, because God is a substance, and *God is charity*.[8] Therefore there are Three and not more: One loving Him, who is from Him, and One loving Him from whom He is, and the Love [dilectio] Itself, which if it is nothing, how is God love? If He is not the Substance, how is God a substance? »

Cap. III.

Quod Spiritus sanctus, sicut Patri et Filio est communis, ita commune nomen habet proprium.

Hic notandum est, quod sicut Spiritus sanctus in Trinitate specialiter dicitur caritas, quae est Patris et Filii unio, ita et nomen tenet proprie, quod Patri et Filio communiter quodam modo congruit. Unde Augustinus in quinto decimo libro de Trinitate:[9] « Si caritas, inquit, qua Pater diligit Filium, et Patrem diligit Filius, ineffabilem communionem demonstrat amborum, quid convenientius, quam ut ille proprie dicatur caritas, qui spiritus est communis ambobus? Hoc enim sanius creditur et intelligitur, ut non solum Spiritus sanctus caritas sit in illa Trintate, sed non frustra proprie caritas nuncupetur, propter illa quae dicta sunt; sicut non solus in illa Trinitate vel *spiritus* est vel *sanctus*, quia et Pater spiritus et Filius spiritus, et Pater sanctus et Filius sanctus, et tamen ipse non frustra dicitur Spiritus sanctus. Qui enim est communis ambobus, id vocatur ipse proprie, quod ambo communiter. Alioquin si in illa Trinitate solus Spiritus sanctus est caritas, profecto et Filius non solius Patris, sed etiam Spiritus sancti Filius invenitur. Ait enim Apostolus[10] de Deo Patre: *Transtulit nos in regnum Filii caritatis suae*. Si ergo non est in illa Trinitate caritas Dei nisi Spiritus sanctus, Filius est etiam Spiritus sancti. Sed quia hoc absurdissimum est, restat ut non solus ibi sit caritas Spiritus sanctus, sed propter illa de quibus satis disserui, proprie sic vocatur ».

Chapter III

That the Holy Spirit, just as He is common to the Father and to the Son, so has a common proper name.

Here it must be noted, that just as the Holy Spirit in the Trinity is especially said (to be) the Charity, which is the Union of the Father and of the Son, so He also has a name properly, which is befitting [congruit] to the Father and to the Son commonly in a certain manner. Whence (St.) Augustine says in the fifteenth book On the Trinity:[9] « If the charity, by which the Father loves the Son, and the Son loves the Father, demonstrates the ineffable communion of Both, what more conveniently (does this), than that He properly be said (to be) the Charity, which is the spirit common to them both? For this is more sanely believed and understood, that not only is the Holy Spirit the charity in that Trinity, but that He is not in vain properly called [nuncupetur] "charity", on account of those things which have been said; just as there is not either only *a spirit* and/or *a holy one* in that Trinity, because both the Father (is) spirit and the Son (is) spirit, and the Father holy and the Son holy, and nevertheless He is not in vain said (to be) "The Holy Spirit". For He who is common to Them both, is Himself called properly, that which Both (are) commonly. Otherwise if in that Trinity only the Holy Spirit is charity, then [profecto] too the Son is found (to be) not only of the Father, but also the Son of the Holy Spirit. For the Apostle[10] says of God the Father: *He has transferred us into the kingdom of the Son of His charity*. If, therefore, there is not in that Trinity a charity of God except the Holy Spirit, (The Son) is also the Son of the Holy Spirit. But because this is most absurd, it remains [restat] that there not only the Holy Spirit is Charity, but on account of those things of which we have sufficiently spoken in order, is called thus properly. »

---

[1] Ibid. v. 11-13. — Vat. sola inepte *quia* pro *qua*.
[2] Vat. cum ceteris edd. contra originale: *Ipse ergo Deus est dilectio*.
[3] Omnia in hoc capitulo sunt ex Augustino, XV. de Trin. c. 17. n. 30. et 31. — Paulo ante finem textus

[1] Ibid., vv. 11-13. — The Vatican text alone ineptly reads *that* [quia] for *with which* [qua].
[2] The Vatican text together with the rest of the editions contrary to the original reads: *Therefore, God Himself is love* [Ipse ergo Deus est dilectio].

post *Deus dilectio* Vat. cum paucis codd. omittit *est*.
[4] Infra dist. XVII. — Vat. contra mss. et edd. 1, 5, 8 omittit *dilectionem* post *sed etiam*, et hic cum ed. 4 legit *explicatur* pro *explicabitur*.
[5] Vers. 1. — Antea post *Nunc* edd. 1, 8 *ergo* pro *vero*.
[6] Cap. 4. et 5. n. 6 et 7; ex ultimo cap. etiam sequentes huius capituli textus excerpti sunt. In fine primi textus pro *consistit* cod. D et codd. 1, 8 *subsistit*, quod magis placeret, si faveret Augustinus.
[7] Ephes. 4, 8. — Paulo ante pro *sintque* mss. A C D E *suntque* ac forte melius. Deinde codd. A C incipiunt sequentem textum verbis: *Spiritus quoque* pro *Spiritus ergo*.
[8] I. Ioan. 4, 16. — Vat. et ed. 4 post *nihil est* perperam omittunt: *quomodo Deus dilectio est, si non est substantia*.
[9] Cap. 19. n. 37. — Cod. C brevius: *Filius Patrem* loco *Patrem diligit Filius*. Mox codd. B C D et edd. 1, 8 cum originali pro *ineffabilem* legunt *ineffabiliter*, et sic hoc adverbio determinari videtur *diligit*. Denique in fine huius propositionis cod. E et ed. 8 *communis amborum* pro *communis ambobus*.
[10] Col. 1, 13. — Vat. cum pluribus edd. ante *Trinitate* ponit *ista* pro *illa*; postea idem fit ab edd. 3, 5, 9 post *sed propter*.

[3] Everything in this chapter is from (St.) Augustine, On the Trinity, Bk. XV, ch. 17, nn. 30,31. A little before the end of the text at *God is love* [Deus dilectio est] the Vatican text with a few of the codices omits *is* [est].
[4] Below in distinction XVII. — The Vatican text contrary to the manuscripts and to editions 1, 5, and 8, omits *the love* [dilectionem] after *but also* [sed etiam], and here together with edition 4 it reads *is explained* [explicatur] for *shall be explained* [explicabitur].
[5] Verse 1. — Before this after *Now* [Nunc] editions 1 and 8 have *therefore* [ergo] in place of *however* [vero].
[6] Chapters 4 and 5, nn. 6 and 7; from the last chapter of which the following quotes in this chapter have also been excerpted. At the end of the first quote in place of *consists* [consistit] codex D and codices 1 and 8 have *subsist* [sbusistit], which would be more pleasant, if (St.) Augustine had favored it.
[7] Eph. 4:8. — A little before this in place of *and they be* [sintque] manuscripts A C D and E have *and they are* [suntque], and perhaps this is better. Then codices A and C begin the following quote with the words: *The Holy Spirit too* [Spiritus quoque sanctus] in place of *Therefore the Holy Spirit* [Spiritus ergo sanctus].
[8] 1 Jn. 4:16. — The Vatican text and edition 4 after *it is nothing* [nihil est] faultily omit: *how is God love? If He is not the Substance* [quomodo Deus dilectio est, si non est substantia].
[9] Chapter 19, n. 37. — Codex C reads more briefly: *The Son the Father* [Filius Patrem] in place of *The Son loves the Father* [Patrem diligit Filius]. Then codices B C D and editions 1 and 8 together with the original in place of *ineffable* [ineffabilem] read *ineffably* [ineffabiliter], and thus with this adverb seem to modify the prior *loves* [diligit]. Then at the end of this proposition codex E and edition 8 have *the common spirit of them both* [spiritus communis amborum] in place of *the spirit common to them both* [spiritus communis ambobus].
[10] Col. 1:13. — The Vatican text together with very many editions at *Trinity* [Trinitate] puts *that . . . of Them* [ista] in place of *that* [illa]; afterwards editions 3, 5 and 9 after *but on account* [sed propter] read *those things of Theirs* [ista] in place of *those* [illa].

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation that that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM X.

De aeterna processione Spiritus sancti quantum ad personam quae procedit.

ARTICULUS I.

Quaestio I.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 194-196.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

Nunc post Filii aeternitatem de Spiritu sancto, quantum Deo donante, etc.

DIVISIO TEXTUS.

Supra egit Magister de generatione Filii, hic autem agit de processione Spiritus sancti. Et quia gemina est processio Spiritus sancti,[1] aeterna et temporalis, primo agit de processione aeterna, secundo de temporali, infra, distinctione decima quarta: *Praeterea notandum, quod gemina est processio Spiritus sancti* etc. Et quoniam processio Spiritus sancti tripliciter potest comparari, scilicet ad *personam* ad quam est, et ad *principium* a quo est, at ad *generationem* a qua differt, ideo haec pars habet tres; in quarum *prima* Magister agit de processione Spiritus sancti quantum ad personam, quae

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION X

On the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit as much as regards the Person who proceeds.

ARTICLE I

Question 1

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 194-196.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Now after the eternity of the Son let us speak in an orderly manner of the Holy Spirit, etc.

DIVISION OF THE TEXT

Above Master (Peter) dealt with the generation of the Son, but here he deals with the procession of the Holy Spirit. And because there is a twin [genima] procession of the Holy Spirit,[1] the eternal and the temporal, first he deals with the eternal procession, second with the temporal, below, in the fourteenth distinction: *Moreover it must be noted, that there is a twin procession of the Holy Spirit* etc.. And since the procession of the Holy Spirit can be compared in a threefold manner, namely according [ad] to the *Person* to whom He is, and according to the *principle* from which

procedit; in *secunda*, quantum ad principium a quo, infra, distinctione undecima: *Hic dicendum est, Spiritum sanctum esse a Patre et Filio*; in *tertia* vero agit de ipsa per comparationem ad generationem, a qua distinguitur, infra, distinctione decima tertia: *Post haec consideradum est, quantum a talibus, quales nos sumus*.

He is, and according to the *generation* by which He differs, for that reason this part has three (parts); in the *first* of which Master (Peter) deals with the procession of the Holy Spirit as much as regards the Person, who proceeds; in the *second*, as much as regards the Principle from whom (He proceeds), below, in the eleventh distinction: *Here it must be said, that the Holy Spirit is from the Father and Son*; in the *third*, however, he deals with the same by means of a comparison to the generation, by which He is distinguished, below, in the thirteenth distinction: *After these it must be considered, as much by such, as we are*.

Item, *prima* pars, quae continet praesentem distinctionem, habet quatuor. In *prima* dicit, quod Spiritus sanctus procedit ut amor sive caritas vel dilectio; et hoc probat auctoritate Augustini. In *secundo* vero, quia hoc[2] erat dubium, quod Spiritus sanctus esset caritas, movet quaestionem et solvi, ibi: *Et ideo quaerendum, utrum Deus Pater*. In *tertia* vero solutionem per auctoritatem confirmat, tum quantum ad distinctionem, quae est per conmunem acceptionem et propriam, tum etiam quantum ad veritatem, ibi: *Pluribus enim exemplis doceri potest* etc. In *quarta* vero et ultima praedictae solutionis assignat rationem ostendens, quod[3] Spiritus sanctus proprie dicatur caritas, cum caritas sit nomen commune, et hoc ibi: *Hic notandum est, quod sicut Spiritus sanctus in Trinitate*.

Likewise, the *first* part, which contains the present distinction, has four (parts). In the *first* he says, that the Holy Spirit proceeds as love or charity and/or dilection; and this he proves by the authority of (St.) Augustine. In the *second*, however, because there was this[2] doubt, that the Holy Spirit is charity, he moves [movet] the question and solves (it), there (where he says): *And for that reason it must be asked, whether God the Father*. In the *third*, however, he confirms the solution by means of authority, both as much as regards the distinction, which is through the common and proper acceptation, and also as much as regards the truth, there (where he says): *For by more examples one can be taught* etc. In the *fourth* and last, however, he assigns a reason for the aforesaid solution, showing that[3] the Holy Spirit properly is called charity, since charity is the common name, and this there (where he says): *Here it must be noted, that just as the Holy Spirit in the Trinity*.

TRACTATIO QUAESTIONUM.

Ad evidentiam eorum quae dicuntur de Spiritu sancto, in hac parte duo principaliter quaeruntur.

Primo quaeritur de modo procedendi ipsius Spiritus sancti.[4]

Secundo de proprietate ipsius.

Circa primum quaeruntur tria.

TREATMENT OF THE QUESTIONS

For the evidence of those (things) which are said of the Holy Spirit, in this part two (questions) are principally asked.

First there is asked concerning the manner of the proceeding itself of the Holy Spirit.[4]

Second concerning its propriety.

About the first there are three (questions) asked.

Primum est, utrum in divinis sit necesse ponere personam procedentem per modum liberalitatis.
Secundum, uturm sit necesse ponere personam procedentem per modum amoris.
Tertium, si[5] sit necesse ponere personam procedere per modum mutuae caritatis.

The first is, whether among the divine it is necessary to posit a Person proceeding through a manner of liberality.
Second, whether it is necessary to posit a Person proceeding through a manner of love [amoris].
Third, if[5] it is necessary to posit that Person proceeds through a manner of mutual charity.

ARTICULUS I.

De modo procedendi Spiritus sancti.

ARTICLE I

On the manner of the proceeding of the Holy Spirit.

Quaestio I.

Utrum in divinis ponenda sit persona procedens per modum liberalitatis.

Question 1

Whether among the divine there is to be posited a Person proceeding through a manner of liberality.

CIRCA PRIMUM, quod sit necesse ponere personam procedentem per modum liberalitatis, ostenditur hoc modo.

1. Perfectior est dilectio mutua quam reflexa,[6] et perfectior adhuc mutua communicata quam non communicata, quia talis, scilicet non communicata,

ABOUT THE FIRST, that it is necessary to posit a Person proceeding through a manner of liberality, is shown in this manner:

1. More perfect is mutual dilection than reflexive,[6] and more perfect still the mutual communicated than not-communicated, because such, namely the not-communicated,

[1] Cod. A et ed. 1 addunt *scilicet*.
[2] Ex mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3 substitutimus *hoc* loco *hic*. Mox post *sanctus* ex pluribus codd. ut T Y bb cum ed. 1 posuimus *esset* pro *erat*.
[3] Ed. 1 *quare*.
[4] Vat. contra mss. et ed. 1 omittit *sancti*.
[5] Pauci codd. ut X Y *utrum*. Mox cod. V *procedentem* loco *procedere*.
[6] Hoc est, quae ad ipsum diligentem reflectitur, sive qua aliquis diligit naturam propriam, dum dilectio mutua in alterum tendit, quae esse potest vel *communicata* vel *non communicata* (privata), prout aliqui ita mutuo se diligunt, quod etiam velint vel dilectum diligi ab aliis aliosque diligere, vel non. Vide Scot., III. Sent. d. 28. et Aristot., II. Magn. Moral. c. 17. (c. 13). — Mox post *adhuc mutua* cod. M addit *et*.

[1] Codex A and edition 1 add *namely* [scilicet].
[2] From the manuscripts and editions 1, 2 and 3 we have substituted *this* [hoc] for *here* [hic]. Then after *Holy Spirit* [Spiritus sanctus] from very many codices as T Y and bb together with edition 1 we have used the imperfect subordinate subjunctive *is* [esset] for *was* [erat].
[3] Edition 1 reads *why* [quare].
[4] The Vatican text contrary to the manuscripts and edition 1 omits *holy* [sancti].
[5] A few codices as X and Y read *whether* [utrum]. Then codex V has *a Person proceeding* [personam procedentem] in place of *that a Person proceeds* [personam procedere].
[6] That is, that which is reflected toward the very one loving, or by which one loves one's own nature, while mutual love tends unto the other, which love can be *communicated* and/or *not communicated* (private), just as some thus mutually love one another, because they also want that the beloved be loved by others and that he love others, and/or not. See (Bl.

John Duns) Scotus, III. Sent., d. 28, and Aristotle, Magna Moralia, Bk. II, ch. 17 (ch. 13). — Then after *still the mutual* [adhuc mutua] codex M adds *and the* [et].

---

p. 195

videtur sapere amorem libidinosum: ergo si in Deo est summa dilectio et summa delectatio et[1] beatitudo, non est ibi persona, quae mutuo non ametur, sed cui amor mutuus communicetur; sed communicatio amoris mutui est per liberalitatem: ergo etc.

seems to smell [sapere] of libidinous love [amorem]: therefore if in God there is a most high dilection and a most high delectation and[1] beatitude, There there is not a Person, who is not mutually loved, but (rather a Person) to whom a mutual love is communicated; but the communication of a mutual love is through liberality: ergo etc..

2. Item, in his inferioribus duplex invenitur modus procedendi[2] nobilis, scilicet per modum naturae et per modum voluntatis: primo modo emanat Filius a Patre, secundo modo donum a datore; sed omne quod nobilitatis est in creatura, est attribuendum Deo: ergo etc.

2. Likewise, in these inferiors a twofold manner of proceeding[2] is found, namely through a manner of nature and through a manner of will: in the first manner the Son emanates from the Father, in the second manner a gift from a giver; but everything which is of nobility in a creature, must be attributed to God: ergo etc..

3. Item, in Deo est ponere naturam et voluntatem, et sicut naturam perficit fecunditas, ita voluntatem summa liberalitas; sed natura perfecta fecunditate, producit persona aliam personam: ergo pari ratione, voluntate perfecta liberalitate, producit persona[3] aliam personam: et sic etc.

3. Likewise, in God one is to posit [est ponere] a nature and a will, and just as fecundity perfects the Nature, so most high liberality the Will; but with a nature perfected by fecundity, a person produces another person: therefore for equal reason, with a will perfected by liberality, a Person[3] produces another Person: and in this manner etc..

4. Item, omnes creaturae a Deo procedunt per cognitionem, et voluntatem; sed ante creaturarum productionem ponere fuit in divinis emanationem Verbi ab aeterno, in quo Pater omnia fienda disposuit:[4] ergo pari ratione necesse fuit emanare personam, in qua omnia vellet et donaret; sed talis procedit per modum liberalitatis: ergo etc.

4. Likewise, all creatures proceed from God through (His) cognition and willing (of them); but before positing the production of creatures there was among the divine the emanation of the Word from eternity, in whom the Father arraigned [disposuit] all that are to be made:[4] therefore for an equal reason it was necessary that a Person emanate, in whom He would will and grant all (things); but Such proceeds through a manner of liberality: ergo etc..

CONTRA: 1. Non est similis modus procedendi sive exeundi[5] in creaturis respectu Dei et in personis; nam creaturae sunt extrinsecus, personae vero in essentia

ON THE CONTRARY: 1. There is not a similar manner of proceeding or of going forth [exeundi][5] among creatures in respect of God and in the (Divine) Persons; for

unum; sed exitus creaturarum a Deo est per modum liberalitatis: ergo non est ponere personam hoc modo procedere.

creatures are from without [extrinsecus], but the Persons One in Essence; but the going-forth of creatures from God is through a manner of liberality: therefore one is not to posit that a Person proceeds in this manner.

2. Item, exiens per modum voluntatis ab aliquo non assimiliatur in substantia producenti, nec aequatur, nec necessario producitur; sed persona, si procedit in divinis, est in substantia similis et in potestate aequalis nec potens se aliter habere: ergo etc.

2. Likewise, the one going forth through a manner of the will from someone is not assimilated in substance to the one producing, neither is it equated, nor necessarily produced; but a Person, if He proceeds among divine (Persons), is in substance similar and in power equal and He is not able to hold Himself otherwise: ergo etc.

3. Item, in his inferioribus non tantum sunt ista principia nobilia, scilicet natura et voluntas, verum etiam ratio sive operans per artem:[6] ergo si ponuntur duae personae his duobus modis procedentes, debet poni tertia, quae tertio modo procedat; sed illa non ponitur: ergo nec per modum voluntatis ponetur[7] aliqua pari ratione.

3. Likewise, among these inferiors there are not only those noble principles, namely nature and will, but also reason or (that which) operates through art:[6] therefore if there are posited two Persons proceeding in these two manners, one ought to posit a third, which proceeds in a third manner; but that is not posited: therefore neither will any be posited[7] through a manner of the will for an equal reason.

4. Item, quanto pluribus communicatur dilectio, tanto perfectior, quia omne bonum in commune deductum pulcrius elucescit: ergo non solum est ponere tertiam personam, cui amor communicetur secundae,[8] sed etiam quartam, cui amor communicetur tertiae; et sic in infinitum; sed hoc est impossibile in divinis, ut ostensum est supra:[9] ergo est stare in prima persona producente: ergo non est persona procedens per modum liberalitatis.

4. Likewise, as much as dilection is communicated to more, so much (is it) more perfect, because every good-deduced-in-common shines forth more beautifully: therefore not only is one to posit a third Person, to whom love [amore] is communicated to the second,[8] but also a fourth, to whom love is communicated to the third, and thus unto infinity [in infinitum]; but this is impossible among the divine, as has been shown above:[9] therefore (love) is to stand still in the first Person producing: therefore there is not a Person proceeding through a manner of liberality.

CONCLUSIO.

In divinis per modum liberalitatis procedit tertia persona, quae dicitur Donum.

CONCLUSION

Among the divine through a manner of liberality there proceeds the third Person, who is called “The Gift”.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod, sicut probatum est,[10] in divinis est ponere tertiam

I respond: It must be said, that, as has been proved,[10] among the divine one is to

personam procedentem per modum liberalitatis, quae dicitur Donum. Et ratio huius est perfectio *dilectionis*, perfectio *emanationis* et perfectio *voluntatis*, qua existente[11] liberalissima, non potest non producere personam; sicut natura, existente fecundissima, non potest non producere personam; et haec est ratio propria huius emanationis.

posit a Third Person proceeding through a manner of liberality, who is called “The Gift”. And the reason for this is the perfection of *dilection*, the perfection of *emanation* and the perfection of the *Will*, by which existing[11] most liberal, cannot not produce a Person; just as the Nature, by existing most fecund, cannot not produce a Person; and this is the proper reason of this emanation.

1. Ad illud quod obiicitur in contrarium, quod creaturae emanant per modum liberalitatis; dicendum, quod per modum liberalitatis emanare est dupliciter: aut sicut *volitum*, aut sicut *ratio volendi*, sive aut sicut donatum,[12] aut sicut ratio donandi. Primo modo emanant creaturae, quae sunt extra; secundo modo emanat tertia in Trinitate persona, quia ratio volendi et donandi est intrinseca perfectissimae voluntati.

1. To that which is objected in the Contrary, that creatures emanate through a manner of liberality; it must be said, that to emanate through a manner of liberality is twofold: either as a (thing) *willed* [volitum], or as *a reckoning of willing*, or either as a (thing) granted,[12] or as a reckoning of granting. In the first manner there emanates creatures, which are without [extra]; in the second manner there emanates the Third Person in the Trinity, because a reckoning of willing and of granting is intrinsic to the most perfect Will.

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod voluntas non est[13] principium assimilans nec necessario emanans; dicendum, quod voluntas sive liberalitas dupliciter est principium: *uno* modo distinctum in natura, et sic non assimilat in substantia; *alio* modo concomitante[14] natura, et sic in substantia assimilat. Quoniam igitur persona sic procedit per modum liberalitatis, ut tamen concomitetur natura: ideo similis in substantia, quamvis ipse modus procedendi non sit per modum similis; et sic patet illud.

2. To that which is objected, that a will is not[13] a principle assimilating nor necessarily emanating; it must be said, that a will or liberality is a twofold principle: in *one* manner distinct in nature, and thus does not assimilate in substance; in *another* manner by a concomitant[14] nature, and thus in substance assimilates. Therefore since a Person thus proceeds through a manner of liberality, to however be concomitant in the Nature: for that reason (He is) similar in substance, although the manner of proceeding itself be not through a manner of the similar; and in this manner that is clear.

---

[1] Vat. reluctantibus vetustioribus mss. repetit hic *summa*. Mox maiorem mss. partem ut A C D G K L O R S U V W X Y Z secuti, pro *nec cui amor mutuus non communicetur* substituimus *sed cui amor mutuus comunicetur*, quo sententia Doctoris distinctior exprimitus, si supples post *sed*: est persona scil. Spiritus S. Vide infra q. 3, et a. 2. q. 2. Alii codd. ponunt loco *sed* vel *et* ut codd. F H P Q T, vel ut cod. ff *sive*, vel ut cod. cc *sed et*, ed. 1 autem *id est*. [Tr. -- In fine propositionis textus criticalis legit perperam *ego* pro *ergo*.]
[2] In Vat. et cod. cc, antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 renitentibus, *producendi*, sed minus cohaerenter cum subnexis. Mox cod. T *procedit* loco *emanat*.

---

[1] The Vatican text, opposing the more ancient manuscripts, repeats here *a most high* [summa]. Then a greater part of the manuscripts, as follows, A C D G K L O R S U V W X Y Z, in place of *nor (a Person) to whom a mutual love is not communicated* [nec cui amor mutuus non communicetur] we have substituted *but (rather a Person) to whom mutual love is communicated* [sed cui amor muttus communicetur], by which the sentence of the Doctor is more distinctly expressed, if you supply after *but* [sed]: there is a Person, that is, the Holy Spirit. See below q. 3, and a. 2, q. 2. The other codices in place of *but* [sed] put *and* [et], as codices F H P Q and T do, and/opr as codex ff, *or* [sive], and/or as codex cc *but*

[3] Fide vestutiorum mss. et ed. 1 restituimus non apte omissum *persona*.
[4] August., Enarrat. in Psalm. 61. n. 18. seq. Vide infra d. 27. p. II. q. 2. — Paulo ante cod. O *necesse fuit ponere* pro *ponere fuit*.
[5] Ita fere omnes codd. cum ed. 1, dum Vat. cum cod. cc solummodo ponit *producendi* omisso *sive exeundi*. Mox codd. aa bb post *liberalitatis* addunt *vel voluntatis* et cod. Y in fine argumenti ponit *procedentem* loco *procedere*.
[6] Vide Aristot. IX. Metaph. text. 10. et XII. text. 13. (VIII. c. 5. et XI. ch. 3.).
[7] Vat., plurimus mss. et ed. 1 refragantibus, *ponitur*.
[8] Ed. 1 *primae et secundae*.
[9] Dist. 7. q. 2. fundam. penuit., et d. 2. q. 3.
[10] Hic in fundam. et d. 2. q. 4.
[11] Cod. U *quia voluntate existente*.
[12] Vat. cum cod. cc *datum*, sed contra antiquiores codd. et ed. 1, qui et omisso primo *aut* pro secundo ponunt *sive*; at grammatice non ita bene.
[13] Multi codd. ut A B D I S T W Z etc. cum ed. 1 *habet*, sed cum subnexis minus cohaerenter.
[14] Praeferimus lectionem plurium mss. ut R X Y et ed. 1, qui loco *cum communicante* legunt *concomitante*, dum alii ut C L O T U habet *comitante*, alii ut F G H I etc. *communicante*. Hac de re vide supra d. 6. q. 2. et 3. Eadem lectionum diver- / -sitas reperitur paulo infra respectu verbi *concomitetur*, ubi Vat. etiam particulam *tamen* omittit.

also [sed et], but edition 1 has *that is* [id est]. [Tr. Note: At the end of this first fundament the critical text faultily reads *I* [ego] for *ergo* [ergo]].
[2] In the Vatican text and codex cc, disagreeing with the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, has *producing* [producendi], but less coherently with what is subjoined. Then codex T has *proceeds* [procedit] in place of *emanates* [emanat].
[3] Trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 we have restored the not-aptly omitted *Person* [persona].
[4] (St.) Augustine, Enarrat. in Psalm. 61, n. 18 ff.. See below, d. 27, p. II, q. 2. A little below codex O has *it was necessary to posit* [necesse fuit ponere] for *one was to posit* [ponere fuit].
[5] Thus nearly all codices together with edition 1, while the Vatican text together with codex cc alone puts *producing* [producendi], having omitted *or of going-forth* [sive exeundi]. Then codices aa and bb after *liberality* [liberalitatis] add *and/or of the will* [voluntatis] and codex Y at the end of the argument puts *a Person proceeding in this manner* [personam in hoc modo procedentem] in place of *that a Person proceeds in this manner* [personam in hoc modo producere].
[6] See Aristotle, Metaphysics, Bk. XI, text 10, and Bk. XII, text 13 (Bk. VIII, ch. 5, and Bk. XI, ch. 3).
[7] The Vatican text, disagreeing with very many manuscripts and edition 1, reads *is . . . posited* [ponitur].
[8] Edition 1 has *to the first and to the second* [primae et secundae].
[9] Distinction 7, q. 2, penultimate fundament, and d. 2, q. 3.
[10] Here in the fundament and d. 2, q. 4.
[11] Codex U *because by a will existing* [quia voluntate existente].
[12] The Vatican text together with codex cc has *given* [datum], but against the more ancient codices and edition 1, which also first having omitted *either* [aut] for the second put *or* [sive]; but grammatically this is not good.
[13] Many codices as A B D I S T W Z etc. together with edition 1 have *does not have* [habet non], but less coherently with what is subjoined.
[14] We prefer the reading of very many manuscripts, as R X Y and edition 1, which in place of *with a communicant* [cum communicante] read *by a concomitant* [concomitante], while others as C L O T U have *by an accompanying* [comitante], other as F G H I etc. *by a communicant* [communicate]. Concerning this manner see above d. 6, q. 2 and 3. The same diversity of reading / is found a little below this in regard to the word *will be concomitant* [concomitetur], where the Vatican text even omits the particle *nevertheless* [tamen].

p. 196

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quare non procedit

3. To that which is objected, wherefore

aliqua persona per modum rationis; dicendum, quod omnis modus producendi nobilis ad istos duos reducitur; quia omne agens aut agit naturaliter, aut per voluntatem; — agens enim per violentiam, aut per fortunam est agnes imperfectum, et modus producendi minus nobilis[1] — unde ratio non distinguitur contra naturam et voluntatem quantum ad modum agendi; et ideo non est persona tali modo procedens.

there proceeds no person through the manner of reason; it must be said, that every manner of noble producing is reduced to those two; because every agent either acts naturally, or through its will; — for an agent through violence, or through fortune is an imperfect agent, and (its) manner of producing less noble[1] — whence (its) reason is not distinguished against nature and will as much as regard the manner of acting; and for that reason there is no Person proceeding in such a manner.

Sed tamen hoc non videtur plene solvere, quia nos distinguimus in his creaturis egressum per modum *liberalitatis* ab egressu per modum *artis*. Et[2] propterea dicendum, quod processus per modum liberalitatis est dupliciter, aut sicut *ratio* liberalitatis sive ipsa liberalitas, aut sicut *liberaliter factum*; similiter et in *arte*, aut sicut *ipsa ars* sive ratio artificiandi, aut sicut *artificiatum*; et primo modo potest cadere in divina persona, secundo modo non. Et primo modo procedit Filius, qui est «Verbum et ars plena omnium rationum viventium ».[3] Sed iste modus emanandi non distinguitur a modo emanandi per modum naturae, quia emanat ut omnino similis et per modum similitudinis perfectae. Alius autem modus non potest esse,[4] quia duas personas necesse est communicare in eadem natura, et quia necesse est, quod omnis modus emanandi, qui est in divinis, sit per modum naturae principaliter, vel illa concomitante.[5] Unde cum processus per modum *voluntatis* possit esse intrinsecus, sicut[6] procedit amor ab amante; per modum vero *artis* semper est extrinsecus, in quantum huiusmodi: ideo impossibile est quod cadat in Deo respectu personae, sed cadit solum respectu creaturae.

But, nevertheless, this does not seem to solve (the matter) fully, because we distinguish among these creatures an “egress through a manner of *liberality*” from an “*egress through a manner of art*”. And[2] on that account it must be said, that a processing [processus] through a manner of liberality is twofold, either as a *reckoning* of liberality or liberality itself, or as (a thing) *liberally made*; similarly also in *art*, either as *art itself* or a reckoning of art-making [artificiandi], or as (a thing) *artfully-made* [artificiatum]; and in the first manner it can occur [cadere] in a divine Person, in the second manner (it can) not. And in the first manner proceeds the Son, who is « the Word and the Art full of all living reasons ».[3] But that manner of His emanating is not distinguished from the manner of emanating through a manner of a nature, because He emanates as One entirely similar and through a manner of perfect similitude. But the other manner cannot be,[4] because it is necessary to communicate two Persons in the same Nature, and because it is necessary, that every manner of emanating, which is among the divine, be through a manner of nature principally, and/or with that (nature) concomitant.[5] Whence since a processing through a manner of *will* could be from within [intrinsecus], just as[6] love [amor] proceeds from the lover; but through a manner of *art* it is always from without [extrinsecus], inasmuch as (it is) of this kind: for that reason it is impossible that it occur [cadat] in God in respect of a Person, but it does occur only in respect of a creature.

4. Ad illud quod ultimo obiicitur: si est

4. To that which is last objected: if one is to

ponere tertiam personam ob communicationem, pari ratione et quartam; dicendum, quod omnis ratio et natura concordat, quod non fiat per plures quod potest sufficientissime fieri per unum; aliquin est ibi superfluum.[7] Si ergo mutua dilectio non potest esse minus quam ad unum, et communicatio illius mutuae non minus quam ad unum, et in uno est mutua dilectio, et in altero mutuae dilectionis communicatio perfectissime, cum uterque[8] accipiat totum infinite; patet quod non est ultra procedere, sed ibi est stare. Unde ipsa eadem ratio, quae ponit personarum pluralitatem, aufert infinitatem et ponit trinitatem.

posit a third Person on account of a communication, for an equal reason also a forth; it must be said, that every reckoning and nature concord, because there does not come to be through more what can come to be most sufficiently through one; otherwise There there is (something) superfluous.[7] If, therefore, a mutual dilection cannot be less than toward one, and the mutual communication of that (dilection) not less than toward one, and there is in one a mutual dilection, and in the other a mutual communication of dilection in a most perfect manner, since each of the Two[8] accepts the Whole infinitely; it is clear that one is not to proceed further (in positing other Persons), but is to stand still there (in the Three). Whence the very same reason, which posits a plurality of persons, bears off an infinity and posits a Trinity.

SCHOLION.

I. Spiritus sanctus habet nomen Doni, et quidem Doni, in quo omnia donantur (cfr. d. 18. per totam). Quidquid autem donatur, datur *per modum liberalitatis*. Quo sensu Seraphicus hic accipiat hanc locutionem, explicatione indigere videtur. *Liberalitas* praeter specialem vitutem moralem implicite etiam importat rationem *libertatis* seu voluntatis, uti docetur in solut. ad 3. Cum igitur duplex sit modus emanandi in Deo, scil. per modum naturae et per modum voluntatis, et processio Spiritus sancti sit per modum voluntatis, illa intrinseca perfectio divinae voluntatis, quae se diffundit et exprimit in processione Spiritus sancti, ut Doni omnium donorum, a Sancto vocatur *liberalitas*. Insuper notandum, quod voluntas in Deo potest accipi vel quatenus secundum nostrum modum intelligendi distinguitur ut *potentia* contra naturam, vel quatenus concomitatur ipsam naturam eamque communicat in ratione obiecti summe amabilis. In primo sensu voluntas est principium fecundum in productione rerum creatarum, non vero in productione Spiritus sancti; in secundo vero sensu est principium Spiritus sancti. Unde patet quod dicit ad 1. 2; intelligitur etiam quod supra d. 6. q. 2. dictum est de differentia inter

SCHOLIUM

I. The Holy Spirit has the name of "Gift", and indeed of the Gift, in which all things are given (cf. d. 18 throughout). But whatever is given, is given *through a manner of liberality*. In which sense the Seraphic (Doctor) may here accept this expression, seems to require explanation. *Liberality*, besides the special moral virtue, implicitly also conveys a reckoning of *liberty* or of will, as is taught in the solution to n. 3. Since, therefore, there is a twofold manner of emanating in God, namely, through the manner of the Nature and through the manner of the Will, and the procession of the Holy Spirit is through a manner of will, that intrinsic perfection of the Divine Will, which diffuses and expresses itself in the procession of the Holy Spirit, as of the Gift of all gifts, is called by the Saint *liberality*. Moreover, it must noted, that “will” in God can be accepted and/or, insofar (as it is) according to our manner of understanding, distinguished as a *potency* against the Nature, and/or insofar as it is concomitant to the same Nature and communicates It in the reckoning of an Object most highly lovable. In the first sense the Will is the fecund principle in the production of created things, but not in the production of the Holy

productionem Filii et Spiritus sancti. Filius enim procedit a Patre per modum *naturae*, concomitante voluntate; et quia per modum *naturae* procedit, procedit ut omnino similis Patri et perfecta ipsius imago (cfr. infra d. 31. a. 1. q. 2.). Spiritus sanctus vero producitur per modum *voluntatis*, concomitante natura, similis quidem, immo idem omnino in natura, tamen sic, quod vi processionis *ratio imaginis* completius sit in Filio.

Spirit; but in the second sense it is the principle of the Holy Spirit. Whence it is clear what he says ad 1 and 2; one also understands what has been said above in d.6, q. 2, concerning the difference between the production of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. For the Son proceeds from the Father through a manner of *nature*, with the Will concomitant; and because He proceeds through a manner of *nature*, He proceeds as one entirely similar to the Father and as His perfect Image (cf. below d. 31, a. 1, q. 2). But the Holy Spirit is produced through a manner of *will*, with the Nature concomitant, indeed similar, nay rather entirely the Same in Nature, nevertheless in this manner, that by the force of the procession the *reckoning of image* is more completely in the Son.

II. Argumentum ultimum in fundam., quod ab emanatione creaturarum deducitur, approbatur etiam ab Alex. Hal., S. Thom. (hic in Comment.), Richard. aliisque, sed ab Aegid. (hic) immerito impugnatur, de quo videsis Dionys. Carth. (hic q. 1. circa med.).

II. The last argument in the fundament, which is deduced from the emanation of creatures, is approved even by Alexander of Hales, St. Thomas (here in his Commentary.), Richard (of Middletown) and others, but is (here) unmeritedly impugned by Giles (the Roman), concerning which one may see (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian (here at q. 1 about the middle).

III. De ipsa quaestione Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 43. m. 1. qui, ut dicit hic Dionys. Carth., « de his plenissime scribit, immo quod iam ex multis doctoribus est inductum, ipse pene totum solus in scripto suo expressit, multaque alia, quae aliorum nullus conscripsisse videtur ». — Scot., hic q. unic. — S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 1. seq. — B. Albert., I Sent. d. 13. a. 4; de hac et seqq. qq. S. p. I. tr. 7. q. 31. m. 2. — Petr. a. Tar., de hac quaest. et seq. hic q. 1. a. 2. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 1. q. 1. — Aegid. R., hic 1. princ. q. 1. — Henr. Gand., S. a. 61. q. 10. — Dionys. Carth., de hac et seq. hic q. 1. — Biel, hic q. 2. concl. 3.

III. Concerning the question itself see Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 43, m. 1, who, as (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian says here, « he writes most fully of these things, nay rather, because it had already be overlooked by many teachers, he alone of the all expressed it in his writings, and many other things, which none of the others seemed to have written about. ». — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, here at q. sole. — St. Thomas, here at q. 1, a. 1 ff.. — Bl. (now St.) Albert (the Great), Sent., Bk. I, d. 13, a. 4; concerning which and the following questions, Summa., p. I, tr. 7, q. 31, m. 2. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, concerning this question and the following here at q. 1, a. 2. — Richard of Middletown, here at a. 1, q. 1. — Giles the Roman, here in 1st. principle of q. 1. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 61, q. 10. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, concerning this and the following question, here at q. 1. — (Gabriel) Biel, here at q. 2, concl. 3.

[1] De agente per violentiam vide Aristot., III. Ethic. c. 1. et II. Magn. Moral. c. 8. et 9. (c. 7. et 8.). — De agente per fortunam cfr. XII. Metaph. text. 13. (XI. c. 3.). et II. Phys. text. 39. et seqq. (c. 4-6).
[2] Supplevimus ex plurimis mss. et ed. 1. particulam *Et*.
[3] August., VI. de Trin. c. 10 n. 11. — Paulo infra cod. A *consimilis* loco *similis*.
[4] Supple cum ed. 1: *in divinis*.
[5] Eodem modo, quo paulo superius, etiam hic lectionum occurrit varietas: Vat. cum pluribus codd. *communicante*, alii ut G T U *comitante*, alii ut H R O X Y aa bb ff cum ed. 1 exhibent lectionem nostram.
[6] Vat. cum pluribus codd. perperam *sic*.
[7] Vide Aristot. et Averroem, I. Phys. text. 50. et 56. (c. 6), et VIII. Topic. c. 4. (c. 9. circa finem), ubi respectu syllogismi dicitur: Est autem quoddam et idem ad syllogismos peccatum, quando ostenditur per longiora, quod contingit per breviora. — In hac propositione Vat. *esset* pro *est*. Paulo ante in cod. M post *natura* satis bene additur *in hoc*.
[8] Plurimum mss. ut A F G H I K R U Y etc. et ed. 1 auctoritate pro *utrumque* substituimus *uterque*, quo sensus redditur clarior.

[1] Concerning an agent through violence see Aristotle, Ethics, Bk. III, ch. 1, and Greater Morals, Bk. II, ch. 8 and 9 (ch. 7 and 8). — Concerning an agent through fortune cf. Metaphysics, Bk. XII, text 13 (Bk. XI, ch. 3), and Physics, Bk. II, text 39 ff. (ch. 4-6).
[2] We have supplied from very many of the manuscripts and edition 1 the particle *And* [et].
[3] (St.) Augustine, On the Trinity, Bk. VI, ch. 10 and 11. — A little below this codex A has *One entirely (and) completely similar* [omnino consimilis] in place of *One entirely similar* [omnino similis].
[4] Supply with edition 1: *among the divine* [in divinis].
[5] In the same manner, as a little more above this, there occurs even here a variety of readings: the Vatican text with very many codices has *communicant* [communicante], others as G T and U have *accompanying* [comitante], others as H R O X Y aa bb ff together with edtion 1 exhibit our reading.
[6] The Vatican text together with very many codices faultily reads *in the same manner as* [sic] rather than *just as* [sicut].
[7] See Aristotle and Averroes, Physics, Bk. I, text 50 and 56 (ch. 6), and Topics, Bk. VIII, ch. 4 (ch. 9 near the end), where in regard to the syllogism there is said: Moreover there is a certain and identical sin against syllogisms, when there is shown through longer (arguments), what is grasped through short ones. — In this proposition the Vatican text has *would be* [esset] for *is* [est]. A little before this in codex M after *nature* [natura] there is sufficiently well added *in this* [in hoc].
[8] On the authority of very many manuscripts as A F G H I K R U Y etc. and edition 1 we have substituted *each of the Two* [uterque] for *both of the Two* [utrumque], by which the sense is rendered clearer.

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM X.

ARTICULUS I.

Quaestio II.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 197-199.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION X

ARTICLE I

Question 2

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 197-199.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUAESTIO II.

Utrum in divinis ponenda sit persona procedens per modum amoris sive caritatis.

SECUNDO QUAERITUR, utrum in divinis sit necesse ponere personam procedentem per modum amoris sive caritatis. Et quid sic, videtur.

1. Non est[1] perfecta cognitio sine dilectione, ergo nec perfectum verbum sine amore: ergo nec perfecta emanatio verbi sine emanatione amoris: ergo necesse est ponere emanationem per modum amoris: ergo etc.

2. Item, amor est donum, in quo omnia[2] alia dona donantur; nihil enim proprie donatur nisi ex amore; si ergo persona procedit per modum liberalitatis, cum ipsa procedat non per aliud, sed per se; ergo per modum amoris sive caritatis.

3. Item, omnis et summa perfectio pluralitatis est in unitate, ergo et distinctionis in unione; sed inter omnes uniones, quae sunt inter distantes, summa et iucundissima est unio caritatis; si ergo est ibi distinctio, est unio; et si unio, est caritatis emanatio.

4. Item, Spiritus sanctus, in nobis existens et habitans, facit nos similes illi summae Trinitati, sicut dicit Dominus, Ioannis decimo

QUESTION 2

Whether among the divine there is to be posited a Person proceeding through a manner of love or charity.

SECOND THERE IS ASKED, whether among the divine it is necessary to posit a Person proceeding through a manner of love [amoris] or charity. And that (it is) so, seems:

1. There is no[1] perfect cognition without dilection [dilectione], therefore neither a perfect word without word [amoris]: therefore neither a perfect emanation of the Word without an emanation of love [amoris]: therefore it is necessary to posit an emanation through a manner of love: ergo etc..

2. Likewise, love [amor] is a gift, in which all[2] other gifts are given; for nothing properly is given except out of love; if therefore a Person proceeds through a manner of liberality, since It proceeds not through something else, but through Itself; therefore through a manner of love or charity.

3. Likewise, every and the most high perfection of plurality is in unity, therefore (the perfection) also of distinction (is) in a union; but among all unions, which are among distant (beings), the most high and most jocund is the unity of charity; therefore if there is a distinction There, there is union; and if a union, there is an emanation of charity.

4. Likewise, the Holy Spirit, dwelling and existing in us, causes [facit] us to be similar to that Most High Trinity, just as the Lord

septimo:[3] « Ut sint unum, sicut et nos »; sed Spiritus sanctus, in nobis existens, producit primo amorem caritatis, ad Romanos quinto:[4] « Caritas Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris etc. ». Ergo necesse est, in illa summa Trinitate reperiri per prius emanationem caritatis.

says, in the seventeenth (chapter of the Gospel) of (St.) John:[3] « That they might be one, just as We (are) also »; but the Holy Spirit, existing in us, produces first the love of charity, according to the fifth (chapter of St. Paul's Letter to) the Romans:[4] « The charity of God has been poured upon our hearts ». Therefore it is necessary, that in that most high Trinity, through (a consideration of what is) prior, there be discovered an emanation of charity.

Sed contra: 1. Pesonae divinae sunt hypostases perfectae, ut Pater et Filius; nullus autem amor dicit hypostasim, sed eius proprietatem sive habitum: ergo nulla persona in divinis procedit per modum amoris.

But on the contrary: 1. The Divine Persons, such as the Father and the Son, are perfect hypostases; but no "love" [amor] means a hypostasis, but (rather) its property or habit: therefore no Person among the divine proceeds through a manner of love.

2. Item, amor est eius in quo requiescit affectus: ergo semper accipitur ut in alium tendens; sed omnis persona est in se perfecte ens et distincta: ergo nulla persona procedit per modum amoris.

2. Likewise, love belongs to the one in whom affection rests: therefore it is always accepted as one tending unto the other; but every person is perfectly a being in himself and distinct: therefore no person proceeds through a manner of love.

3. Item, non ob aliud ponitur in divinis emanatio per modum amoris, nisi quia Pater amat Filium; cum ergo Filius amet Spiritum sanctum, pari ratione erit ponere ulteriorem personam emanantem per modum amoris, et sic in infinitum; et[5] hoc est incoveniens: ergo etc.

3. Likewise, not on account of something else [ob aliud] is an emanation through a manner of love posited among the divine, but because the Father loves the Son; therefore since the Son loves the Holy Spirit, for an equal reason there will be a positing of a further person emanation through a manner of love, and thus unto infinity; and[5] this is unfitting: ergo etc..

4. Item, cum in natura intellectuali ex parte potentiae motivae sit accipere irascibilem, quae respicit honorem, sicut concupiscibilem, quae respicit amorem,[6] quaestio est, quare in divinis non accipitur persona secundum actum irascibilis, sicut secundum actum concupiscibilis?

4. Likewise, since in an intellectual nature on the part of the motive power there is an accepting of the irascible, which respects honor, just as the concupiscible, which respects love,[6] there is the question, wherefore among the divine is a person not accepted according to the act of the irascible, just as according to the act of the concupiscible?

5. Item, cum sint aliae *affectiones* in anima, ut guadium, spes, et huiusmodi, quare solum per modum amoris procedit persona in divinis? *Si tu dicas*, quod amor non tenet rationem affectionis, tunc obiicio, quia sicut amor divinus[7] non est affectio, ita nec gaudium.

5. Likewise, since there are other *affections* in the soul, such as joy, hope, and (things) of this kind, wherefore does there proceed only through a manner of love a Person among the divine? *If you say*, that love does not have a reckoning of affection, then I object, because just as divine[7] love is not an affection, so neither (is divine) joy.

6. Item, cum sint alii *habitus* in anima importantes complementum, cuiusmodi sunt scilicet dona Spiritus sancti, ut

6. Likewise, since there are other *habits* in the soul conveying it to completion [importantes complementum], of which kind

intelligentia[8] et sapientia; quare magis procedit persona per modum amoris, quam per modum alterius habitus? Quod si non alius, nec iste debet poni, ut videtur.

are namely the gifts of the Holy Spirit, such as intelligence[8] and wisdom; wherefore does there rather proceed a Person through a manner of love, than through the manner of the other habit? Because if the other ought not be posited, neither this one, as it seems.

CONCLUSIO.

Spiritus sanctus per modum amoris procedit, quia procedit per modum voluntatis et liberalitatis.

CONCLUSION

The Holy Spirit proceeds through a manner of love, because He proceeds through a manner of the will and liberality.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod, sicut probatum est supra,[9] necesse est aliquam personam in divniis procedere per modum liberalitatis, et illam dicimus Spiritus sanctum. Hanc autem necesse est procedere per modum amoris; quia, si ponatur in divnis emanatio[10] per modum voluntatis, necesse est, quod inter omnes sit *prima* et *nobilissima*. Emanatio autem per modum amoris est huiusmodi, quod patet, si respiciamus, in anima. Affectio enim amoris est *prima* inter omnes affectiones et radix omnium aliarum, sicut ostendit Augustinus in pluribus locis, maxime in decimo quarto de Civitate Dei.[11] Et ista affectio *nobilissima* est inter omnes, quoniam plus / tenet de ratione liberalitatis.

I respond: It must be said, that, just as has been proved above,[9] it is necessary that some Person among the divine proceed through a manner of liberality, and That One we call the Holy Spirit. Moreover it is necessary that This One proceed through a manner of love; because, if one posits among the divine an emanation[10] through a manner of the will, it is necessary, that among all (affections) it be *first* and *most noble*. But an emanation through a manner of love is of this kind, which is clear, if we look back, in the soul. For the affection of love is *first* among all the affections and the root of all others, just as (St.) Augustine shows in very many passages, most of all in the fourteenth (book) of The City of God.[11] And that affection is the *most noble* among (them) all, since it has / more of the reckoning of liberality.

---

[1] Mss. et ed. 1 postulantibus, expunximus hic a Vat. additum *enim*. Mox post *cognitio* cod. W addit *boni*. — Cfr. De hoc argumento August., IX. De Trin. c. 10. n. 15. ubi et ait: Verbum est . . . cum amore notitia.
[2] Ex multis mss. et ed. 1 adiecimus *omnia*. — Plura de hac propositione vide infra d. 18. q. 1.
[3] Vers. 22.
[4] Vers. 5. — Mox cod. U *communicationem* loco *emanationem*.
[5] Ed. 1 *sed* pro *et*.
[6] Praestamus lectionem distinctiorem antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 pro lectione Vat. et cod. cc *sic concupiscibilis amorem*. Haec motivae potentiae divisio, a Scholasticis recepta, occurit in Nemesii Episc. Emeseni libro de Natura hominis c. 16. et seqq.; ac in Gregorii Nysseni libro de Anima et resurrectione, et in Epistola eiusdem canonica ad S. Letoium; ac Ioan. Damasc., II. De Fide orthod. c. 22, ubi et passiones seu affectiones animae enumerantur. Vide et Aristo., III. De Anima, text. 41. et 53. (c. 9. seq.); de Motu animal. c. 3. (c. 6); II. Ethic. c. 5, et I. Magn. Moral. c. 8. (c. 7. et 8.).
[7] Codd. V Y *in divinis*.
[8] Ed. 1 *intellectus*. Paulo infra post *si non* codd. T V

[1] As required by the Manuscripts and edition 1, we have expunged here from the Vatican edition the added *for* [enim]. Then after *cognition* [cognitio] codex W adds *of the good* [boni]. — Cf. on this argument (St.) Augustine, On the Trinity, Bk. IX, ch. 10., n. 15 where he also says: The Word is . . . knowledge with love.
[2] From the many manuscripts and edition 1 we have added *alll* [omnia]. — See the very many other things regarding this proposition below in d. 18, q. 1.
[3] Verse 22.
[4] Verse 5. — Then codex U has *communication* [communicationem] in place of *emanation* [emanationem].
[5] Edition 1 has *but* [sed] in place of *and* [et].
[6] We prefer the more distinct reading of the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 to the reading of the Vatican edition and of codex cc *just as the love of the concupiscible* [sic concupiscibilis amorem]. This division of the motive powers, received by the Scholastics, occurs in the book by Nemesius, Bishop of Emesa, On the Nature of Man, ch. 16 ff.; and in (St.) Gregory of Nyssa's book, On the Soul and the Resurrection, and in the same's canonical Letter to

addunt *est*.
[9] Quaest. Praeced.
[10] Codd. R T et ed. 1 *processio*.
[11] Cap. 7-9. Mss. et omnes edd. falso citant XIV, *de Trin.* — Paulo ante ex plurimis mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *ostendit* loco *dicit*. Mox post *Unde* cod. Y *haec* pro *hoc*.

St. Letoius; and (St.) John Damascene's, On the Orthodox Faith, Bk. II, ch. 22, where the passions or affections of the soul are ennumerated. See also Aristotle, On the Soul, Bk. III, texts 41 and 53 (ch. 9 ff.); On the Movemetn of Animals, ch. 3 (ch. 6); Ethics, Bk. II, ch. 5, and Greater Morals, Bk. I, ch. 8 (chs. 7 and 8).
[7] Codices V and Y have *among the divine* [in divinis].
[8] Edition 1 has *understanding* [intellectus]. — A little below this codices T and V read *Because if it is not the other, neither ought this one be posited etc.* [Quod si non est alius etc.]
[9] In the preceding question.
[10] Codices R and T and edition 1 have *procession* [processio].
[11] Chapters 7 to 9. The manuscripts and all of the editions falsely cite On the Trinity, Bk. XIV. — A little before this from very many of the manuscripts and edition 1 we have substituted *shows* [ostendit] in place of *says* [dicit]. Then after *Whence* [Unde] on p. 198 codex Y has *this (affection)* [haec] in place of *this* [hoc].

---

tenet de ratione liberalitatis. Unde hoc est donum, in quo omnia alia dona donantur, et in quo consistunt omnes deliciae substantiae intelletualis. Unde nihil in creaturis est considerare ita deliciosum, sicut amorem mutuum; et sine amore nullae sunt deliciae.[1] Propter hoc dicit Philosophus,[2] quod amicitia aut est beatitudo, aut non sine beatitudine. Si ergo emanatio est per modum liberalitatis in divinis, necesse fuit esse[3] primam et summam; et sic necesse fuit esse per modum amoris.

has more of the reckoning of liberality. Whence this is the gift, in which all other gifts are given, and in which all delights of intellectual substance consist. Whence there is nothing among creatures that (they) consider so delicious, as mutually love; and without love there are no delights.[1] On this account the Philosopher says,[2] that friendship is either beatitude, or not without beatitude. If, therefore, there is an emanation through a manner of liberality among the divine, it was necessary that it be[3] first and most high; and thus it was necessary that it be through a manner of love.

1. Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur, quod amor nominat habitum, non substantiam; dicendum, quod est loqui de amore ratione eius *quod nominat*, et sic non dicit substantiam: vel ratione eius *circa quod ponitur*; et quia ponitur in Deo, in quo nullum accidens, sed totum[4] substantia est, ideo non dicit habitum vel proprietatem, sed magis substantiam; et cum dicat egressum, dicit hypostatism sive personam. Simile dicendum est de Verbo.[5]

1. To that which is, therefore, objected, that "love" [amor] names a habit, not a substance; it must be said, that there is talk of love by a reckoning of that *which it names*, and in this manner it does not mean substance; and/or by reckoning of that *about which it is posited*; and because it is posited in God, in whom (there is) no accident, but He is entirely[4] substance, for that reason it does not mean a habit and/or a property, but rather the Substance; and since (love) means an egress, it means (also) a Hypostasis or Person. A similar (argument) must be said concerning the Word.[5]

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod amor

2. To that which is objected, that the love

caritatis semper in alium tendit, et ita procedit in alium et non stat in se; dicendum, quod procedere in alium est dupliciter: aut quia aliud respicit ut obiectum, aut quia in aliud tendit et recipitur. *Primo* modo bene convenit personae in divinis, quia bene convenit habere respectum ad aliam personam; unde Spiritus sanctus est amor, quo Pater amat Filium. Si autem dicatur tendere *secundo* modo, sic non habet locum in proposito, quia, quando ego amo alium, amor non exit a me, ita ut recipiatur in alio, sed tantum a voluntate procedit, et quia est accidens, ideo non recedit, sed in voluntate subsistit. In divinis vero, quia hypostatis est, ideo in se subsistit.

of charity always tends unto an other [in alium], and thus proceeds into an other and does not stand in itself; it must be said, that "proceeding into an other" is (said) in a twofold manner: either because it looks-back to something else as its object [aliud respicit ut obiectum], or because it tends unto something else and is received (in that). *In the first* manner it is very fitting for a Person among the divine, because it is very fitting (that One Person) have respect for another Person; whence the Holy Spirit is the Love, by which the Father loves the Son. But if (love) means a "tending" in the *second* manner, thus it has no place in the proposed, because, when I love an other, love does not go forth from me, so that it is received in another, but only proceeds from (my) will, and because it is an accident, for that reason it does not go back [recedit], but subsists in (my) will. But among the divine, because (love) is a Hypostasis, for that reason It subsists in Itself.

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod similiter Filius amans Spiritum sanctum produceret aliam personam; dicendum, quod hoc non tantum facit, quod Pater et Filius producant aliam personam, quia[6] est amor, quo se amant, sed etiam, quia in eis voluntas est fecundissima. Ratio huius dicetur infra,[7] et illa non est in Spiritu sancto. Nihilominus tamen potest dici, quod status est in primo amore. Nam primo amore producto, cum ille se ipso amet[8] et ametur, non oportet, alium amorem produci sive aliam personam per modum amoris.

3. To that which is objected, that similarly the Son, loving the Holy Spirit, would produce an other Person; it must be said, that He does not do this only, because the Father and the Son produce an other Person, because (this Person)[6] is the Love, by which They love Themselves, but also, because in Them there is a most fecund Will. The reason for this will be said below,[7] and this is not in the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, however, it can be said, that there is a standing-still [status] in the first love. For with the first Love produced, since He loves[8] by His very self and is loved, it is not opportune, that there be produced another Love or another Person through a manner of love.

4. Ad illud quod qaueritur, quare non est emanatio quantum ad actum irascibilis? Quidam respondent, quod haec vis non habet locum in substantia pure spirituali; tamen supposito, quod sit in substantia intellectuali, adhuc actus eius non competit productioni personae, tum quia naturaliter sequitur actum concupiscibilis; « ira enim est vindex laesae concupiscentiae », ut dicit Damascenus;[9] tum etiam, quia actus eius consistit aut respectu *superioris*, et hoc non potest esse ubi nihil est superius; aut respectu *inferioris*, et hoc similiter non, quia nulla est inferioritas ibi; respectu *paris*

4. To that which is asked, wherefore is there non an emanation as much as regards the act of the irascible? Certain (authors) answer, that this power [vis] does not have a place in a purely spiritual substance; however supposing, that it is in an intellectual substance, its act is still not competent for the production of a person, both because naturally it follows the act of the concupiscible; « for wrath is the vindicator of wounded concupiscence », as (St. John) Damascene says;[9] and also, because its act consists either in respect *of a superior*, and this cannot be where there

similiter non potest esse in Deo, quia sic est cum quadam disconvenientia et victoriosa repulsione;[10] in personis autem divinis summam unionem et convenientiam esse necesse est. *Et si tu obiicias*, quod non omnis actus irascibilis est respectu disconventientis, quod patet in spe, et quia in Beatis habebit irascibilis actum; dicendum, quod vel consistit respectu disconvenientis vincendi, vel respectu ardui aggrediendi, et ita vel gradum vel disconventiantiam dicit; sed neutrum potest esse in divinis personis.

is nothing superior; or in respect *of an inferior*, and this similarly (can) not (be), because there is no inferiority There; in respect *of an equal* similarly cannot be in God, because in this manner there is (an irascible act) with a certain coming-apart [disconvenientia] and victorious repulsion;[10] but among the Divine Persons it is necessary that there be a most high union and coming together [convenientiam]. *And if you object*, that not every irascible act is in respect of one coming-apart, which is clear in hope, and because among the Blessed one will (still) have the irascible act; it must be said, that it consists in respect of one *coming-apart* to conquer, and/or in respect of a difficulty [ardui] of stepping-towards, and thus means a step and/or a coming-apart; but neither can be among Divine Persons.

5. 6. Ad illud quod obiicitur de aliis *affectibus* et *habitibus*, iam patet responsio. Quia amor est affectus intimus et primus et nobilissimus, quia origo omnium aliorum, ideo complectitur in se totam nobilitatem emanationis per modum liberalitatis: ideo nulla persona debuit emanare per modum alterius habitus, cum talis modus non sit principalis.

5. 6. To that which is objected concerning the other *affections* and *habits*, the response is already clear. Because love is the most interior, and first, and most noble affections, because (it is) the origin of all the others, for that reason, it embraces in itself the whole nobility of emanation through a manner of liberality: for that reason no person ought to emanate through the manner of the other habit, since such a manner is not a principle.

SCHOLION.

I. Amor seu caritas in divinis accipitur tripliciter: *essentialiter*, et sic est illa *complacentia*, qua quaelibet persona diligit se et duas alias personas; *notionaliter*, et sic est ipsa spiratio activa sive *concordia* in spirando, qua Pater et Filius spirant Spiritum sanctum; *personaliter*, et sic est ipsa persona procedens i.e. Spiritus sanctus (cfr. Infra a. 2. q. 1.) Et notandum, quod Spiritus sanctus non procedit ut id quid datur per amorem, sed ut amor datus sive productus.

SCHOLIUM

I. Love or charity among the divine is accepted in a threefold manner: *essentially*, and thus there is that *complacence*, by which any Person loves Himself and the other two Persons; *notionally*, and thus there is that active spiration or *concordance* in spirating, by which the Father and the Son spirate the Holy Spirit; *personally*, and thus there is that Person proceeding, i.e. the Holy Spirit (cf. below a. 2, q. 1). And it must be noted, that the Holy Spirit does not proceed as something which is given through love, but as the Love given or produced.

[1] Cfr. supra d. 1. a. 2. q. 1.

[2] Libr. IX. Ethic. c. 9, ubi conversa probatur, quod scil. beatitudo non sit sine amicitia. — In seqq. locis probatur amicitiam coniunctam esse iucunditati: VIII. Ethic. c. 1; II. Magn Moral. c. 12. (c. 11) et VII. Moral. Eudem. c. 2. seqq. ac 1. Rhet. c. de Iucundis.

[3] Cod. O *necesse est eam esse*. Mox, consentientibus mss. et ed. 1, post *fuit* adiecimus *esse*.

[1] Cf. above d. 1, a. 2, q. 1.

[2] Ethics, Bk. IX, ch. 9, where the converse is proved, namely that beatitude is not without friendship. — In the following passages it is proven that friendship has been conjoined with jocundity: Ethics, Bk. VIII, ch. 1; Greater Morals, Bk. II, ch. 12 (ch. 11) and Eudaemonean Morals, Bk. VII, ch. 2 ff, and Rhetorics, Bk. 1, ch. "On Pleasantries".

[3] Codex O has *it is necessary that it be* [necesse est

[4] Plurimi codd. cum ed. 1 non ita bene *tota*. Vat. hic contra antiquiores codd. et ed. 1 repetit *in Deo*.
[5] In Vat. hic additur *quamvis enim verbum in nobis sit accidens, et tamen substantia in Deo*, sed obest auctoritas mss. et ed. 1.
[6] Supple: haec persona. Praeferimus hanc lectione, in qua et convenit maior pars codd. ut I L O R S T U W X Y etc., dum Vat. hic *quae* loco *quia*, et mox *quia* pro *quod* habet; ceteri autem codd. vel consentiunt lectioni Vat. totaliter, vel tantum partialiter; sic cod. K cum ed. 1 *quae est amor, quo*.
[7] Dist. 11. q. 2. et d. 13. q. 3. — Mox post *status* plurimorum mss. et ed. 1 fide substituimus *est* pro *sit*.
[8] Vat. cum cod. cc. addit *alium*, quod deest in antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1. Mox multi codd. ut A C F G H K L R S U V W X Y etc. *illum* pro *alium*.
[9] Libr. II. de Fide orthod. c. 16: Est porro ira rationis satelles, vindex cupiditatis.
[10] Vat. praecedentia exhibet ita: *nulla est inferioritas in persona producta respectu Patris, non similiter potest esse in Deo respectu disconventientis, quia sic est cum quadam disconvenientia in victoriosa repulsione*, quae lectio interpolata et distorta castigatur auctoritate mss. qui quoad lectionis substantiam omnes inter se oncentiunt et cum ed. 1.

eam esse]. Then, agreeing with the manuscripts and edition 1, we have inserted after *was* [fuit], *that it be* [esse].
[4] Very many codices together with edition 1 have not so well *the whole* [tota]. The Vatican edition here, against the more ancient codices and edition 1, repeats *in God* [in Deo].
[5] In the Vatican edition there is here added *for although the word in us is an accident, (it is) in God, however, the Substance*, but this is against the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1.
[6] Supply: this Person. We prefer this reading, in which agree the greater part of the codices, such as I L O R S T U W X Y etc., while the Vatican edition here has *which* [quae] in place of *because* [quia], and then *because* [quia] for *because* [quod]; but all the other codices either consent with the reading of the Vatican edition entirely, or only in part; thus codex K together with edition 1 has *which is the Love, by which* [quae est amor, quo].
[7] Distinction 11, q. 2, and d. 13, q. 3. — Then at *a standing-still* [status] trusting in very many of the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 we have substituted *there is* [est] for *there may be* [sit].
[8] The Vatican edition together with codex cc adds *an other* [alium], which is lacking in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1. Then many codices, such as A C F G H K L R S U V W X Y etc. have *that Love* [illum] for *another Love* [alium amorem].
[9] On the Orthodox Faith, Bk. II, ch. 16: Furthermore there is the wrath belonging to the reckoning "attendent", the vindicator of cupidity.
[10] The Vatican edition exhibits the preceeding sentence thus: *there is no inferiority in the Person produced in respect of the Father, it cannot be similar in God in respect of one comming-apart, because in this manner there is a certain comming-apart in a victorious repulsion*, which interpolated and distorted reading is corrected by the authority of the manuscripts, which, in regard to the substance of the reading, all agree among themselves and with edition 1.

---

p. 199

II. Quaestio in solut. ad. 4. tacta, utrum vis irascibilis habeat locum in substantia spirituali, resolvitur quoad Deum a S. Bonaventura (I. Sent. d. 45. dub. 10.) cum sententia communi sic: « Vis irascibilis et ira non recipitur in Deo nisi trassumitive ». Quoad Angelos et appetitum *rationalem* animae humanae Henr. Gand. (Quodl. 8. q. 15.) affirmat, in appetitu rationali distinguiendam esse vim irascibilem et concupiscibilem; sed ipsius argumenta a Scot. (III. Sent. d. 26. q. unic.) impugnantur.

II. Having touched upon the question in solution n. 4, whether the irascible power has a place in a spiritual substance, is resolved by St. Bonaventure in regard to God (Sent., Bk. I, d. 45, dubium 10) with the common sentence in this manner: « The irascible power is not received in God except transumptively ». In regard to the Angels and the *rational* appetite of the human soul, Henry of Ghent (Quodlibetals, 8, q. 15) affirms, that in the rational appetite there must be distinguished the

Etiam S. Thom. (S. I. q. 59. a. 4.) illam distinctionem Henr. Gand. non admittit, nec Richardus (II. Sent. d. 24. a. 2. q. 3.); etiam Petr. a Tar. (III. Sent. d. 26. a. 7.) hanc negativam sententiam reputat probabiliorem. Propriam suam sententiam Scot. explicat alibi (III. Sent. d. 34. q. unic.), admittendo aliquam distinctionem ex parte obiecti, cui consentiunt S. Bonav. (II. Sent. d. 25. p. I. q. 6. ad 2, et d. 24. p. I. a. 2. q. 1; III Send. d. 33. a. 1. q. 3.) et Alex. Hal. (S. p. II. q. 29. m. 3.)

irascible and the concupiscible power; but his arguments are impugned by (Bl. John Duns) Scotus (Sent. Bk. III, d. 26, q. sole). Even St. Thomas (Summa., I, q. 59, a. 4) does not admit that distinction of Henry of Ghent, neither does Richard of Middletown (Sent., Bk. II, d. 24, q. 2. q. 3) ; even (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise (Sent., Bk. III, d. 26, a. 7) reputes this negative sentence as more probable. Scotus explains his own sentence elsewhere (Sent., Bk. III, d. 34, q. sole), by admitting some distinction on the part of the object, to which St. Bonaventure (Sent., Bk. II, d. 25, p. I, q. 6, ad 2, and d. 24, p. I, a. 2, q. 1; Sent., Bk. III, d. 33, a. 1, q. 3.) et Alexander of Hales (Summa., p. II, q. 29, m. 3) agree.

III. Ipsa quaestio non ab omnibus antiquis explicite tractatur. Cfr. Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 43. m. 2. a. 2. — Scot., hic q. unic., et infra d. 32. q. 1. — S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 1; S. I. q. 37. a. 1. — B. Albert., hic a. 2. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 1. a. 2. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 1. q. 2. — Henr. Gand., S. a. 61. q. 5.

III. The question itself is not explicitly treated by all the ancient writers. Cf. Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 43, m. 2, a. 2. — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, here in his question sole, and below in d. 32, q. 1. — St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 1; Summa. , I, q. 37, a. 1. — Bl. (now St.) Albert (Magnus), here in a. 2. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1, a. 2. — Richard of Middletown, here in a. 1, q. 2. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 61, q. 5.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION X

DISTINCTIONEM X.

ARTICULUS I.

Quaestio III.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 199-200.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

QUAESTIO III.

Utrum in divinis ponenda sit tertia persona procedens per modum mutuae caritatis.

Tertio quaeritur, utrum sit necesse ponere tertiam personam procedentem per modum mutuae caritatis. Et quod sic, videtur.

1. Ioannis decimo septimo:[1] *Ut sint unum, sicut et nos*; Dominus orat et petit discipulis unitatem, non naturae, sed dilectionis per conformitatem ad illam summam unitatem; sed membra Christi uniuntur per amorem mutuum: ergo in divinis est exemplar huius: sic etc..[2]

2. Item, Hieronymus super Psalmum decimum septimum:[3] « Spiritus sanctus est amor, quem habet Pater in Filium, et Filius in Patrem »: ergo est amor mutuus.

3. Item, *ratione* ostenditur hoc ipsum, quia perfectior est dilectio, quando est mutua, quia si non est mutua, ex altera parte claudicat; sed in illa dilectione est summa perfectio et nulla claudicatio: ergo etc.

4. Item, qui non amat vicissim amantem se recte et liberaliter aut est iniquus, aut ingratus; cum ergo in divinis nulla sit iniquitas, nulla ingratitudo, necesse est ibi esse amorem mutuum.

Contra: 1. Si est amor mutuus, ergo Filii in Patrem et Patris in Filium: ergo Pater aliquid recipit a Filio: quod absurdum est.

ARTICLE I

Question 3

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 199-200.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUESTION 3

Whether among the divine there is to be posited a Third Person proceeding through a manner of mutual charity.

Third it is asked, whether it is necessary to posit a Third Person proceeding through a manner of mutual charity: And that (it is) so, seems:

1. From the seventeenth (chapter of the Gospel of St.) John: [1] *That they may be one, even as We*; the Lord prays and asks for the unity of (His) disciples, not of nature, but of dilection through a conformity to that most high Unity; but the members of Christ are united through a mutual love: therefore among the divine there is an exemplar of this: thus etc.. [2]

2. Likewise, (St.) Jerome on the seventeenth Psalm (says): [3] « The Holy Spirit is the Love, which the Father has for [in] the Son, and the Son for [in] the Father »: therefore He is a mutual love.

3. Likewise, *by reason* this very (thing) is shown, because dilection is more perfect, when it is mutual, because if it is not mutual, it is deflected [caludicat] on the part of the other; but in that dilection there is a most high perfection and no deflection: ergo etc..

4. Likewise, he who does not love in turn the one loving him rightly and liberally either is iniquitous [iniquus], or ungrateful; therefore since among the divine there is no iniquity, no ingratitude, it is necessary that there be There a mutual love.

On the contrary: 1. If He is a mutual love, therefore of the Son for [in] the Father and of the Father for the Son: therefore the Father receives something from the Son:

which is absurd.

2. Item, qui amat amantem facit quod debet, quia hoc est debitum, quod rependendum est; ergo si est in divinis amor mutus, ergo est debitus: ergo non est liberalissimus, quod absurdum est.

2. Likewise, he who loves one loving (him) does what he ought [debet], because this is the debt [debitus], which must be repaid; therefore if among the divine there is a mutual love, therefore it is a debt [debitus]: therefore it is not most liberal, which is absurd.

3. Item, nullus amor mutuus est amor unicus; haec per se nota est; ergo si Spiritus sanctus est amor mutuus, unicus non est amor.

3. Likewise, no mutual love is a unique love; this is self-evident [per se nota] ; therefore if the Holy Spirit is a mutual love, He is not the unique Love.

4. Item, si amor est mutuus, ergo est amor Patris ad Filium; sed iste, ut dicit Richardus,[4] est amor gratuitus, similiter erit Filii ad Patrem; et iste, ut ipse dicit, est amor debitus: ergo si tertia persona procedit per modum amoris gratuiti et debiti, ergo est amor ex utroque permixtus: ergo non amor purus. Et *iterum*, cum iste amor sit Filius, videtur quod Filius sit Spiritus sanctus, quia ut dicit Richardus, [5] in Filio est amor ex utroque permixtus.

4. Likewise, if He is a mutual love, therefore He is the love of the Father for [ad] the Son; but (as) that (love of His), as Richard (of St. Victor) says,[4] is a gratuitous love, similarly shall (that) of the Son for the Father be; and that (love of His), as the same says, is a owed love [amor debitus]: therefore if the Third Person proceeds through a manner of gratuitous and owed love, therefore He is a love thoroughly mixed from each: therefore not a pure love. And *again*, since that love is the Son, it seems that the Son is the Holy Spirit, because as Richard (of St. Victor) says, [5] in the Son there is a love thoroughly mixed from each.

CONCLUSIO.

Tertia persona procedit per modum mutuae caritatis.

CONCLUSION

The Third Person proceeds through a manner of mutual charity.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod cum amor perfectionem delectationis[6] et unionis et rectitudinis habeat ex mutualitate, aut non est personam ponere in divinis procedere per modum amoris, aut, si procedit, procedit per modum mutuae caritatis.

I respond: It must be said, that since love has the perfection of delectation[6] and union and rectitude out of a mutuality, either it is not that one posits a Person among the divine to proceed through a manner of love, or, if He does proceed, he proceeds through a manner of mutual charity.

1. Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur in contrarium, quod tunc Filius aliquid dat Patri; dicendum, quod ex hoc, quod amans per amorem tendit in amatum, nihil dat ei; alioquin nos daremus aliquid Deo, cum ipsum amamus.

1. To that which is, therefore, objected in the Contrary, that then the Son gives something to the Father; it must be said, that from this, that one loving tends through love unto the one loved, he gives nothing to him; otherwise we would give something to God, when we love Him.

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod amor mutuus est debitus; dicendum, quod debitus est, quia rectus; sed tamen amor non considerat debitum. Unde quantumcumque debeatur, dum tamen debitum non attendatur, non minuitur ratio liberalitatis, immo ostenditur ratio rectitudinis.

2. To that which is objected, that mutual love is a debt; it must be said, that it is a debt, because it is upright; but love, however, does not consider (itself) a debt. Whence however much it be owed, while yet the debit is not attended to, the reckoning of liberality is not diminished, nay the reckoning of rectitude is shown.

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur: si mutuus, non unicus: [7] dicendum, quod verum est in amantibus, quorum affectus sunt diversi; non sic est in Deo.

4. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod non est amor purus; dicendum, quod ex utraque parte liberalis est, et ideo omnino purus. Et quod[8] dicit Richardus, quod est amor debitus et gratuitus; dicendum, quod istae conditiones non dicunt modum amandi circa amorem, sed dicunt modum emanandi sive originis circa personas.

[1] Vers. 22.
[2] Pauci codd. ut H I P Q: *et sic patet etc.*
[3] Vide lit. Magistri, c. 2. post medium.
[4] Libr. V. de Trin. c. 17. et seqq. — Mox post *gratuitus* in Vat. praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 additur *ergo*, et paulo infra contra multos codd. ut A G K T Z etc. et ed. 1 habetur *ille* loco *iste*.
[5] Ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *Richardus*.
[6] Nonnulli codd. ut A F K U Z cum ed. 1 *dilectionis*.
[7] Cod. X *obiicitur: nullus amor mutuus est unicus*.
[8] Vat. loco *quod* habet *cum*, deinde omittit *Richardus*, refragantibus vetustioribus mss. et ed. 1, sicuti et paulo infra ponit perperam *emanandi* pro *amandi.*

3. To that which is objected: if mutual, not unique: [7] it must be said, that it is true among lovers, whose affections are diverse; not so is it in God.

4. To that which is objected, that (mutual love) is not a pure love; it must be said, that on the part of each it is liberal, and for that reason entirely pure. And what[8] Richard (of St. Victor) says, that it is a love, owed and gratuitous; it must be said, that those conditions of his do not mean a manner of loving about love, but mean a manner of emanating or of origin about the Persons.

[1] Verse 22.
[2] A few codices, such as H I P Q, have: *and thus it is clear etc.*[et sic patet etc.].
[3] See the text of Master (Peter), ch. 2, second half.
[4] On the Trinity, Bk. V, ch. 17 ff. — Then after *gratuitous love* [amor gratuitus] in the Vatican edition, not trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, there is added *therefore* [ergo], and a little below this against many codices, such as A G K T Z etc. and edition 1, there is had *He* [ille] in place of *that (love of His)* [iste].
[5] From the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 we have supplied *Richard* [Richardus].
[6] Not a few codices, such as A F K U Z, together with edition 1 have *of dilection* [dilectionis].
[7] Codex X has *is objected: no mutual love is unique* [obiicitur: nullus amor mutuus est unicus].
[8] The Vatican edition in place of *what* [quod] has *when* [cum], then it omits *Richard* [Richardus], disagreeing with the older manuscripts and edition 1, just as also a little below this it faultily puts *of emanating* [emanandi] in place of *of loving* [amandi].

p. 200

SCHOLION.

I. In solut. ad 4. verba locum Richardi a S. Victore exponentia: « Non dicunt modum amandi circa amorem etc. » hunc sensum habent: Pater habet amorem *gratuitum*, quia non est ab alio, Filius amorem *permixtum*, quia a Patre procedit et cum ipso producit Spiritum sanctum, cui attribuitur amor *debitus*, quia non producit personam, sed ipse producitur. Cum vero amor in tribus personis sit idem et purissimus, locutio Richardi sumenda est non in sensu proprio, sed mteaphorico; unde Scholastici posteriores eam non probabant. Cfr. Bulifer ad hunc locum S.

SCHOLIUM

I. In the solution to n. 4 the words expounding the passage of Richard of St. Victor: « They do not mean a manner of loving about love etc.» have this sense: The Father has a *gratuitous* love, because He is not from an other, the Son a *thoroughly mixed* love, because He proceeds from the Father and with Him produces the Holy Spirit, to whom is attributed an *owed* love, because He does not produce a Person, but is Himself produced. But since the love among the Three Persons is the same and most pure, the saying of Richard is to be taken non in the proper sense, but

Bonaventurae.

metaphorically; whence the latter Scholastics did not prove it. Cf. Brulifer on this passage of St. Bonaventure.

II. Quoad conclusionem Cfr. Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 13. m. 5. — Scot., I. Sent. d. 12. q. 1, et d. 32. q. 1. ad 3. 4. — S. Thom., hic q. 1. q. 2. — B. Albert., hic a. 7. — Petr. a. Tar., hic a. 2. q. 2.* — Richard a Med., hic a. 1. q. 3. — Henr. Gand., S. a. 61. q. 4, et a. 54. q. 6. n. 47. — Biel. I. Sent. d. 12. q. 2. nota 3.

II. In regard to the conclusion, cf. Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 13, m. 5. — (Bl. Joh n Duns) Scotus, Sent., Bk I., d. 12, q. 1, and d. 32, q. 1. in reply to n. 3 and 4. — St. Thomas, here in a. 1. q. 2. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 7. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in a. 2, q. 2. — Richard of Middletown, here in a. 1, q. 3. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 61, q. 4, and a. 54, q. 6, n. 47. — (Gabriel) Biel., Sent., Bk. I., d. 12, q. 2, nota 3.

* In textu criticalis perperam *q.2. a.2.*

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM X.

ARTICULUS II.

Quaestio I.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 200-201.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION X

ARTICLE II

Question 1

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 200-201.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

ARTICULUS II.

De proprietate Spiritus Sancti.

Secundo principaliter quaeritur de secunda parte, scilicet de proprietate Spiritus sancti, et circa hoc quaeruntur tria.

Prima quaeritur, utrum amor sive caritas sit proprium Spiritus sancti.
Secundo, utrum Spiritus sanctus sit proprie nexus.
Tertio, utrum Spiritus sanctus proprie sit spiritus.

QUAESTIO I.

Utrum amor sive caritas sit proprium Spiritus sancti.

Circa primum, quod caritas sit proprium Spiritus sancti, sic ostenditur.

1. Augustinus decimo quinto de Trinitate:[1] « Sicut in illa Trinitate non solus Spiritus sanctus est spiritus, tamen proprie dicitur Spiritus sanctus; ita, quamvis Pater sit caritas et Filius caritas, tamen proprie caritas dicitur illa persona, sicut proprie dicitur Spiritus sanctus ».

2. Item, hoc idem ostendiur per eundum super primam Canonicam Ioannis,[2] ubi intendit proprietatem Spiritus sancti invenire, et ad hoc perducit sermonem, quod Spiritus sanctus est caritas.

3. Item, *ratione* ostenditur illud idem: quia[3] illud est proprie proprium personae, quod dicit modum emanandi ipsius; sed amor est huiusmodi, ut probatum est:[4] ergo etc.

4. Item, sicut verbum se habet ad Filium, ita amor ad Spiritus sanctum; sed verbum est proprium Filii: ergo amor proprium Spiritus sancti.

Contra: 1. Augustinus in decimo quinto de Trinitate:[5] « Pater est caritas, et Filius est caritas, et Spirtus sanctus est caritas, et simul omnes una caritas »: ergo caritas non dicitur proprie de Spiritus sancto.

2. Item, amor non procedit aliter quam

ARTICLE II

On the property of the Holy Spirit.

Second there is principally asked concerning the second part, namely, concerning the property of the Holy Spirit, and about this three (questions) are asked:

First there is asked, whether love or charity is proper to the Holy Spirit.
Second, whether the Holy Spirit is properly a nexus.
Third, whether the Holy Spirit properly is a spirit.

QUESTION 1

Whether love or charity is proper to the Holy Spirit.

About the first, that charity is proper to the Holy Spirit, is shown in this manner:

1. (St.) Augustine in the fifteenth (book of) On the Trinity (says):[1] « Just as in that Trinity the Holy Spirit is not the only spirit, yet is properly called the Holy Spirit; so, although the Father is charity and the Son charity, yet properly charity is said (to be) that Person, just as properly He is said (to be) the Holy Spirit ».

2. Likewise, this same is shown through the same (author in his work) on the First Canonical (Letter of St.) John,[2] where he aims [intendit] to find the property of the Holy Spirit, and arrives at this saying, that the Holy Spirit is charity.

3. Likewise, that same (argument) is shown *by reason*: that[3] that is properly proper to a Person, which means His manner of emanating; but love is of this kind, as has been proven:[4] ergo etc..

4. Likewise, just as "the Word" is reserved [se habet] to the Son, so "Love" to the Holy Spirit; but "the Word" is proper to the Son: therefore "Love" (is) proper to the Holy Spirit.

On the contray: 1. (St.) Augustine in the fifteenth (book of) On the Trinity (says):[5] « The Father is charity, and the Son is charity, and the Holy Spirit is charity, and all at once (are) one charity »: therefore charity is not said properly of the Holy Spirit.

2. Likewise, love does not proceed

amando: ergo cum amor de necessitate insit amanti, et Pater et Filius amando producant Spiritum sanctum, impossibile videtur, quod ei conveniat proprie. Aut ergo Spiritus sanctus non est persona, aut non est amor proprie sive[6] non procedit per modum amoris.

3. Item, sicut se habet sapientia ad Filium, ita amor ad Spiritum sanctum; sed sapientia non est Filii proprium, immo appropriatum solum: ergo et[7] amor similiter Spiritus sancti: ergo etc.

4. Item, omne[8] quod dicitur proprie, importat aliquam relationem: ergo si amor proprie dicitur, importat relationem. Quaero: ad quid? aut ad *amantem*, aut ad *amatum*.[9] Si ad *amantem*, ergo amans non est amor; similiter si ad *amatum*, tunc ergo Spiritus sancut aut non amaret aut non amaretur; hoc autem est impossibile.

otherwise than by loving: therefore since love of necessity is within the one loving, and the Father and the Son by loving produce the Holy Spirit, it seems impossible, that it befit Him properly. Therefore, either the Holy Spirit is not a Person, or He is not love properly or[6] does not proceed through a manner of love.

3. Likewise, just as "Wisdom" is reserved to the Son, so "Love" to the Holy Spirit; but "Wisdom" is not proper to the Son, nay only appropriated: therefore even[7] "Love" similarly (is not proper) to the Holy Spirit: ergo etc..

4. Likewise, everything[8] which is properly said, conveys some relation: therefore if "love" is properly said, it conveys a relation. I ask: for what? either for *the one loving*, or for *the one loved*.[9] If for *the one loving*, therefore the one loving is not love; similarly if for *the one loved*, therefore the Holy Spirit then either would not love or would not be loved; but this is impossible.

---

[1] Cap. 19. n. 37: Sicut non solus est in illa Trinitate vel spiritus vel sanctus . . . et tamen iste non frustra proprie dicitur Spiritus sanctus. Et ibid. c. 17. a. 31: Ita Spiritus sanctus proprie nuncupatur vocabulo caritatis, cum sit univeraliter caritas et Pater et Filius. — Paulo ante fide mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *ostendiur* loco *ostendit*.

[2] Tractat. VII. n. 6. Vide et XV. de Trin. c. 17-20. — Paulo ante Vat. contra mss. et ed. 1 omittit *primam*, et ed. 1 loco *idem* habet *ipsum*. Mox aliqui codd. ut G K T W Y cum ed. 3 *producit* loco *perducit*.

[3] Ope plurimum mss. ut F T Z ff et ed. 1 posuimus *quia* pro *quod*.

[4] Hic, a. 1. q. 2.

[5] Cap. 17. n. 28: Ita et caritas et Pater dicatur et Filuis et Spiritus sanctus et simul omnes una caritas. In quo textu ed. 1 post *omnes* addit *tres*.

[6] Aliqui codd. ut V X Z bb falso *aut* loco *sive*.

[7] Supplevimus hic *et*; mox substituimus gentitivum, *Spiritus sancti* pro dativo, ope mss. et ed. 1.

[8] Postulantibus antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 expunximus hic additum a Vat. *illud*.

[9] In Vat. et cod. cc desunt verba *Quaero* usque *amatum* quae in aliis mss. et ed. 1 habentur.

---

[1] Chapter 19, n. 37 : Just as there is not only in that Trinity a spirit and/or a holy one . . . and nevertheless not as a trick is He properly called "the Holy Spirit". And ibid., ch. 17, a. 31: Thus the Holy Spirit properly is indicated by the word "charity", though universally both the Father and the Son are Charity. — A little before this, trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *is shown* [ostenditur] in place of *shows* [ostendit].

[2] Treatise 7, n. 6. See also On the Trinity, Bk. XV, chs. 17-20. — A little before this the Vatican edition, against the manuscripts and edition 1, omits *first* [primam], and edition 1 in place of *the same (author*) [idem] has *he* [ipsum]. Then some codices, such as G K T W Y together with edition 1, have *he produces* [producit] in place of *he arrives at* [perducit].

[3] With the assistance of very many manuscripts, such as F T Z ff and edition1, we have put *that* [quia] in place of *that* [quod].

[4] Here in a. 1, q. 2.

[5] Chapter 17, n. 28: Thus even both the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are called "charity" and all together (are) the One Charity. In which text edition 1 adds *Three* [tres] after *all* [omnes].

[6] Some codices, such as V X Z and bb falsely have the disjunctive *or* [aut] in place of the alternative *or* [sive].

[7] We have supplied here *even* [et]; then we have substituted the genitive *of the Holy Spirit* [Spiritus sancti] for the dative, with the assistance of the manuscripts and edition 1. [Trans. note : the Latin construction for « proper to » takes a genitive case for the object.]

[8] As required by the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have expunged here the *that* [illud]

added by the Vatican edition.
[9] In the Vatican edition and codex cc the words "I ask . . . or for the one loved?" are lacking, though they are had in the other manuscripts and in edition 1.

CONCLUSIO.

Caritas, personaliter accepta, est proprium Spiritus sancti
essentialiter accepta dicit complacentiam;
notionaliter vero concordiam in spirando.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod dilectio in divnis potest accipi et accipitur necessario *essentialiter*, *notionaliter* et *personaliter*: *essentialiter*, quia quilibet diliget se;[1] *notionaliter* vero, quia Pater et Filius concordant in spirando Spiritum sanctum, quae concordia amor sive dilectio est; *personaliter* vero, quia ille qui producitur per modum perfectae liberalitatis, non potest eese nisi amor sive dilectio.

Unde essentialiter dictum dicit complacentiam, notionaliter vero concordiam in spirando, personaliter vero processum in illa[2] concordia.

Huius autem[3] exemplum potest poni in amore creato, quo sponsus et sponsa se diligunt. Nam diligunt se amore *sociali* ad convivendum; diligunt se ulterius amore *coniugali* ad prolem procreandam, et illa,[4] si produceretur ex sola concordiae voluntate, *amor* esset; nunc vero est *amatus*, nisi dicatur *amor* per emphaticum loquendi modum. In divinis vero vere et proprie amor est, habens rationem *amoris* et *hypostasis*: *amoris* propter hoc, quia ex volunate liberalissima primo procedit per modum perfetae liberalitatis; *hypostatis*, quia cum distinguatur a producente et non possit distingui essentialiter, distinguitur personaliter; non sic autem est in amore creato.

1. 2. Ex hoc patet illud quod obiicitur *primo*

CONCLUSION

Charity, accepted personally, is proper to the Holy Spirit;
accepted essentially it means complacency;
but notionally, the concord in spirating.

I respond: It must be said, that dilection among the divine can be accepted and is necessarily accepted *essentially*, *notionally* and *personally*: *essentially*, because each loves Himself [quilibet diligent se] ;[1] but *notionally*, because the Father and the Son concord in spirating the Holy Spirit, which concord is love or dilection; but *personally*, because He who is produced through a manner of perfect liberality, cannot be but Love or Dilection.

Whence essentially said it means "complacency", but notionally "concord in spirating", and personally "the One Processing in[2] that concord".

Moreover an example of this[3] can be posited in the created love, by which a bridegroom and bride love [diligunt] themselves. For they love themselves with *social* love to live together [ad convivendum]; they love themselves furthermore with a *conjugal* love to procreate offspring, and that (offspring),[4] if it were produced from the will alone of concord, would be *love* [amor]; but now (the offspring) is *one loved*, unless "love" is said through the emphatic manner of speaking. But among the divine there is truly and properly a love, having the reckoning *of love* and *of a hypostasis*: *of love* on account of this, that from a most liberal will He first proceeds through a manner of perfect liberality; *of a hypostasis*, because since He is distinguished from the One producing and cannot be distinguished essentially, He is distinguished personally; but not so is it in created love.

1. 2. From this is clear that which is

et *secundo*, cum dicitur, quod[5] est *proprietas* amantium sive producentium; quia accipitur notionaliter; nam prout ab eis *procedit*, non potest esse proprietas, sed persona distincta. Unde non omnino est similis processus amoris creati et amoris increati,[6] quia hic est proprietas, ibi hypostasis et substantia.

objected in the *first* and *second* (place), when it is said, that ("love") [5] is a *property* of those loving or producing; because ("love") is accepted notionally; for insofar as *He proceeds* from them, He cannot be a property, but a distinct Person. Whence the processing of created love and of uncreated Love is not entirely similar,[6] because here it is a property, There a Hypostasis and Substance.

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur de sapientia, dicendum, quod non est simile; quia sapientia non dicit respectum ad alium, et ideo semper de se dicitur ad se et esset essentiale, nisi approprietur; sed amor respectum dicit ad eos, qui amore nectuntur. Unde sicut verbum est proprium Filii, non appropriatum,[7] quia connotat respectum ad dicentem; sic etiam amor sive caritas non tantum est appropriatum, verum etiam proprium Spiritus sancti. Et sicut procedit Filius a Patre per modum verbi, ita Spiritus sanctus per modum amoris. Et ex hoc est, sicut melius patebit infra,[8] quod haec admittitur: Pater et Filius diligunt se Spiritu sancto; non autem, quod Pater sit sapiens sapientia genita.

3. To that which is objected concerning "wisdom", it must be said, that it is not similar; because "wisdom" does not mean a looking-back to an other, and for that reason it is always said of itself as regards itself and is essential, unless it be appropriated; but "love" means a looking-back to those, who are joined by love. Whence just as "the Word" is proper to the Son, not appropriated,[7] because it connotes a looking-back to the One speaking; so also "love" or "charity" not only is appropriated, but also proper to the Holy Spirit. And just as the Son proceeds from the Father through a manner of a word, so the Holy Spirit through a manner of love. And from this it is, as will be more clear below,[8] that this (saying) is admitted: 'The Father and the Son love Themselves with the Holy Spirit'; not however, that the Father be wise by the begotten Wisdom.

4. Ad illud quod ultimo obiicitur: *ad quid* dicit respectum? dicendum, quod ad amantes, secundum quod hoc quod est *amantes* tenetur notionaliter, sicut praetactum est.[9] Uno enim modo *diligere se* idem est quod *concorditer spirare*; hoc modo Spiritus sanctus non est amans, quia non spirat. Ipse autem obiicit de essentiali,[10] qui non dicit egressum ab amante, sed solum dicit complacentiam voluntatis, qua quilibet amat et amatur.

4. To that which is last objected: *to what* does it mean a looking-back? it must be said, that (it means this) to those loving, according to which that which is "those loving" is held notionally, just as has been touched upon before.[9] For in one manner *to love themselves* is the same (thing) which *to spirate concordantly* (is); in this manner the Holy Spirit is not "loving", because He does not spirate. But he objects this concerning the essential (manner of using the term "love"),[10] who does not mean the egress from one loving, but only means the complacency of the will, by which any (of them) loves and is loved.

SCHOLION.

Doctrina huius questionis est sententia communis: Alex. Hal. S. p. I. q. 43. m. 3. a. 1, et q. 67. m. 3. a. 3. — Scot., hic q. unic., et d. 32. q. 1. — S. Thom., I. Sent. d. 27. a. 2. q. 2*; S. I. q. 37. a. 1. — B. Albert., hic a. 4. — Petr. a Tar., hic a. 2. q. 1. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 2. q. 1. — Aegid. R., hic 1.

SCHOLIUM

The doctrine (contained) in this question is the common sentence: Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 43, m. 3, a. 1, and q. 67, m. 3, a. 3. — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, here at q. sole, and in d. 32, q. 1. — St. Thomas, Sent., Ck. I, d. 27, a. 2, q. 2; Summa., I, q. 37, a. 1. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus),

princ. q. 2. — Henr. Gand., S. a. 38. q. 2. n. 8. — Dionys. Carth., de hac et seq. hic q. 1.

here in a. 4. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in a. 2, q. 1. — Richard of Middletown, here in a. 2, q. 1. — Giles the Roman, here in 1. princ., q. 2. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 38, q. 2, n. 8. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian., on this and the following question, here in q. 1.

---

* In textu criticalis perperam *q. 2. a. 2.* et post *Petr. a Tar.* habet *q. 2. a. 1*.

[1] Cod. O addit *XV. c. 17. de Trin.*

[2] Aliqui codd. ut H I aa bb *ex*. Mox post *concordia* cod. H adiungit: *Primo modo est communis tribus, secundo modo est in Patre et Filio, tertio autem modo est proprium Spiritus sancti*.

[3] Cod. I addit *processus*.

[4] Plurimi codd. incongrue *ille*. Mox post *esset* cod. W adiungit *et ratio amandi*; dein cod. Y *non est amor* pro *amatus*, quod per modum substantivi intelligas. Paulo post per *emphaticum loquendi modum* intellige: emphasim, illam scil. grammaticalem figuram, quae ad maiorem expressionem intimandam adhibetur, v. g. quando abstractum adhibetur pro concreto, cum dicitur: rogo excellentiam tuam.

[5] Subaudi: amor. — Paulo infra post *quia* in codd. I Z additur *amor ibi*.

[6] Nonnulli codd. ut A F R T X cum ed. 1, omissa post *creati* particula *et*, ponunt *amori increato* loco *amoris increati*. Mox particula *hic* refertur ad amorem *creatum*, et *ibi* ad amorem *increatum*. [Trans. nota: melius intelliguntur adverbialiter ut prima ad mundum creatum, secunda ad mundum increatum, quoniam.]

[7] Vat. contra fere omnes codd. et ed. 1 *et non appropriatur*.

[8] Dist. 32. a. 1. q. 1. et a. 2. q. 1. — Paulo ante ed. 1 *sequitur* loco *est*, quae et mox post *haec* addit *bene*.

[9] Hic, in corp. et ad. 1. — Paulo supra Vat. *sed* loco *secundum quod*, at perperam et contra mss. cum sex prima edd., quorum tamen aliqui ut O Z *secundum hoc quod amantes*. Mox plures codd. ut A I S T V W X Y *diligunt* pro *diligere*.

[10] Supple cum cod. I *amore*. Vat. *quod* pro *qui*, sed minus clare et contra plurimos codd. cum ed. 1; aliqui codd. ut H X Y cum edd. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, *quia*.

---

[1] Codex O adds *(Book) XV, chapter 17 of On the Trinity*.

[2] Some codices, such as H I aa and bb, have *out of* [ex]. Then after *concord* [concordia] codex H adds: *In the first manner it is common to the Three, in the second manner it is in the Father and in the Son, but in the third manner it is proper to the Holy Spirit*.

[3] Codex I adds *processing* [processus].

[4] Very many codices incongruously read *he* [ille]. Then after *would be love* [amor esset] codex W adds *and the reason for loving* [et ratio amandi]; then codex Y has *is not love* in place of *one loved* [amatus], which you should understand in the manner of a substantive. A little after this by *emphatic manner of speaking* [emphaticum loquendi modum] understand: emphasis, namely that grammatical figure, which is employed to intimate a greater expression, v. g. as when the abstract is employed for the concrete, when there is said: I beg your Excellency.

[5] Understand: “love”. — A little below this after *because* [quia] in codices I and Z there is added *there “love”* [amor ibi].

[6] Not a few codices, such as A F R T X together with edition 1, having omitted the particle *and* [et], put *to uncreated love* [amori increato] in place of *of uncreated love* [amoris increati]. Then the particle *here* [hic] refers to *created* love, and *there* [ibi] to *uncreated* love. [Trans. note: better to understand both as a parallel construction of adverbs, so that the former refers to the created world, and the latter to Heaven, the uncreated world.]

[7] The Vatican edition, contrary to nearly all the codices and to edition 1, has *and is not appropriated* [et non appropriatur].

[8] Distinction 32, a. 1, q. 1, and a. 2, q. 1. — A little before this edition 1 has *there follows* [sequitur] in place of *it is* [est], which same also then adds *well* [bene] to *is admitted* [admittitur].

[9] Here, in the body and in reply to n. 1. — A little above this the Vatican edition has *but* [sed] in place of *according to which* [secundum quod], but faultily and against the manuscripts together with the six first editions, some of which, however, such as O and Z, have *according to this that “those loving”* [amantes]. Then very many codices, such as A I S T V W X Y, have *they love* [diligunt] in place of *to love* [diligere].

[10] Supply with codex I *love* [amor]. The Vatican edition has *which* [quod] in place of *who* [qui], but less clearly and contrary to very many codices together with edition 1; some codices, such as H X Y together with editions 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, have *that* [quia].

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM X.

ARTICULUS II.

Quaestio II.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 202-203.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION X

ARTICLE II

Question 2

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 202-203.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUAESTIO II.

Utrum Spiritus sanctus sit nexus sive unitas Patris et Filii.

Secundo quaeritur, utrum Spiritus sanctus proprie sit nexus vel unitas amborum. Et quod sic, videtur hoc modo.

1. Augustinus sexto de Trinitate:[1] « Non est aliquis duorum, quo uterque coniungitur »; sed coniungitur nexu: ergo nexus non est aliquis duorum: ergo est tertia persona proprie.

2. Item, amor in creaturis est nexus; sed sicut probatum est,[2] Spiritus sanctus est amor perfectissimus: ergo etc. Quod

QUESTION II

Whether the Holy Spirit is the Nexus or Unity of the Father and the Son.

Second it is asked, whether the Holy Spirit properly is the Nexus and/or Unity of Both. And that (He is) so, seems in this manner:

1. (St.) Augustine in the sixth (book of) On the Trinity (says):[1] « He is not one of the two, by whom Both are conjoined »; but one is conjoined by a nexus: therefore a nexus is not something belonging to the Two: therefore He is properly a third Person.

2. Likewise, love among creatures is a nexus; but just as has been proven,[2] the Holy Spirit is a most perfect love: ergo etc..

autem amor sit nexus, patet per Dionysium:[3] « Amorem, sive divinum sive intellectualem, unitivam dicimus virtutem ».

But that love is a nexus, is clear through Dionysius (the Areopagite):[3] « Love, whether divine or intellectual, we call a unitive virtue ».

3. Item, Spirtus sanctus secundum Graecos procedit a Patre[4] in Filium, secundum Latinos a Patre et Filio. Sed quocumque istorum modorum procedit, uniuntur in Spiritu Pater et Filius; sed ille, in quo uniuntur, est nexus amborum: ergo Spiritus sanctus est nexus.

3. Likewise, the Holy Spirit according to the Greeks proceeds from the Father unto[4] the Son, according to the Latins from the Father and the Son. But in whatever one of these manners He proceeds, there are united in the Spirit the Father and the Son; but He, in whom They are united, is the nexus of both: therefore the Holy Spirit is a nexus.

4. Item, aut Spiritus Patris est Spiritus Filii, aut non. Si non: ergo cum *nemo sciat, quae sunt in homine nisi spiritus eius, qui est in illo*, sicut dicit Apostolus,[5] Pater non novit voluntatem Filii, nec Filius Patris: ergo, si idem est spiritus amborum, in Spiritu uniuntur.

4. Likewise, either the Spirit of the Father is the Spirit of the Son, or not. If not: therefore since *no one knows, what is in a man except the spirit of him, who is in him*, just as the Apostle (says),[5] the Father does not know the will of the Son, nor the Son (that) of the Father: therefore, if the Same is the spirit of (them) both, in the Spirit They are united.

Contra: 1. Non est nexus nisi separatorum, quae enim non separata sunt,[6] non indigent aliquo connectente; sed Pater non est separatus a Filio, nec e converso, quia Filius in Patre et Pater in Filio: ergo etc.

On the contrary: 1. There is no nexus except of (things) separate, for those which have not been separated,[6] do not need something connecting (them); but the Father has not been separated from the Son, nor conversely, because the Son (is) in the Father and the Father in the Son: ergo etc..

2. Item, nexus est in quo duo aliqui conveniunt; sed Pater et Filius non conveniunt in persona: ergo nulla persona est nexus Patris et Filii.

2. Likewise, a nexus is (that) in which some two convene; but the Father and the Son do not convene in a Person: therefore no Person is the nexus of the Father and Son.

3. Item, necti dicuntur illa quae conveniunt in aliquo, in quo uniuntur. Si ergo Filius et Spiritus sanctus originaliter conveniunt in Patre, ergo Pater est nexus Filii et Spiritus sancti: non ergo Spiritus sanctus est nexus.

3. Likewise, those are said to be joined [necti] which convene in something, in which they are united. Therefore if the Son and the Holy Spirit originally convened in the Father, therefore the Father is the nexus of the Son and the Holy Spirit: therefore the Holy Spirit is not a nexus.

4. Item, nexus dicitur, quia[7] nectitur, aut quia nectit; si ergo Spiritus sanctus est nexus, aut ergo quia nectitur, aut quia nectit. Non quia nectitur; quia tunc similiter alia persona esset nexus, similiter Pater esset nexus; si quia nectit Patrem et Filium: ergo dat aliquid Patri et Filio; sed hoc est invonveniens: ergo etc.

4. Likewise, a "nexus" is said, because[7] it is joined, or because it joins; if, therefore, the Holy Spirit is a nexus, therefore, either (it is) that He is joined, or that He joins. (But it is) not that He is joined; because then similarly another Person would be the nexus, similarly the Father would be the nexus; if because He joins the Father and the Son: therefore He gives something to the Father and the Son; but this is unfitting [inconveniens]: ergo etc..

CONCLUSIO.

CONCLUSION

Spiritus sanctus proprie dicitur nexus sive unitas Patris et Filii.

The Holy Spirit properly is said (to be) the Nexus or Unity of the Father and the Son.

RESPONDEO: Dicendum, quod nexus proprie dicitur de Spiritu sancto sive unitas amborum. Ratio autem huius est, quia Pater et Filius communicant in uno[8] Spiritu, et ideo amborum est unitas. *Et rursum*, ille Spiritus est amor, et ideo communicant in eo ut in uno amore; et quia amor propriisime nexus[9] est, ideo Spiritus sanctus proprie nexus est, quia est[10] amor mutuus, est amor unicus et substantificus.

I RESPOND: It must be said, that a "nexus", or "unity" of both, is properly said of the Holy Spirit. Moreover the reason for this is, that the Father and the Son communicate in the One[8] Spirit, and for that reason He is the unity of Both. *And again*, that Spirit is Love, and for that reason They communicate in Him as in one Love; and because love is most properly a nexus,[9] for that reason the Holy Spirit properly is the Nexus, because He is[10] (Their) mutual Love, He is the Unique and 'Substantifying' Love.

1. Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur in contrarium, quod non est nexus nisi separatorum; dicendum, quod separatio dicitur tripliciter: secundum *distantiam*, et sic dicitur separatio localis; et secundum *differentiam per essentiam*,[11] et sic dicitur separatio substantialis; et secundum *differentiam proprietatis relativae*, et sic non dicitur separatio proprie, sed distinctio. Et[12] quolibet istorum modorum contingit esse nexum. Quia ergo Pater et Filius sunt distincti, ideo recte dicuntur connecti.

1. To that which is, therefore, objected in the Contrary, that there is no nexus except of (things) separate; it must be said that "separation" is said in a threefold manner: according to *distance*, and thus one means "local separation"; and according to *difference through essence*,[11] and thus one means "substantial separation"; and according to *difference of relative property*, and thus one does not mean "separation" properly, but "distinction". And[12] a nexus happens to be by any of these manners. Therefore, because the Father and the Son are distinct, for that reason They are rightly said to be "connected".

2. Ad illud quod obiciitur, quod nexus est in / quo aliqui duo conveniunt; . . .

2. To that which is objected, that a "nexus" is that in / which some two convene; . . .

[1] Cap. 5. n. 7: Manifestum est, quod non aliquis duorum est, quo uterque coniungitur.
[2] Hic, a. 1. q. 2 et 3.
[3] De Div. Nom. c. 4. § 15: Amorem . . . unitivam quandam et concretivam intelligimus virtutem.
[4] Mss. et ed. 1 consentientibus, loco *per* substituimus *in* quod et loquendi modo S. Doctoris magis correspondet, de quo cfr. d. seq. q. 1, et d. 14. a. 1. q. 1. in corp. Mox pauci mss. ut aa bb *procedat*, et aliqui codd. ut I Y cum ed. 1 post *Spiritu* addunt *sancto*.
[5] I. Cor. 2. 11. Vulgata: quis enim hominum scit, quae sunt hominis, nisi spiritus hominis, qui in ipso est ? — Vat., obnitentibus mss. et sex primis edd. post *sunt in* addit *aliquo*, et paulo infra post *Apostolus* adiungit *et*. Cod. O conclusionem argumenti ita exhibet: *ergo si est spiritus, et spiritus amborum; et si hoc, ambo in Spiritu uniuntur*.
[6] Cod. T *qui enim non separati sunt*.
[7] In Vat. praemittitur *aut*.
[8] Cod. E *eodem* pro *uno*, quod, ceteris mss. et ed. 1 refragantibus, Vat. minus bene omittit.
[9] Plures codd. ut A C G K L S U V W Y perperam hic addunt *eius*. Mox post *ideo* ed. 1 adiungit *et*.
[10] Vat. omittit *est* legendo *quia amor mutuus est amor unicus et substantificus*; ita etiam aliae edd. et

[1] Chapter 5, n. 7 : . . . it is manifest, that He is not one of the two, through whom Both are conjoined.
[2] Here, in a. 1, qq. 2 and 3.
[3] On the Divine Names, ch. 4, § 15: We understand love (to be) a certain unitive and concretive virtue.
[4] Consenting with to manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *unto* [in] in place of *through* [per], which corresponds more with the manner of speaking of the Seraphic Doctor, concerning which cf. the following distinction, q. 1, and d. 14, a. 1, q. 1 in the body. Then a few manuscripts, such as aa and bb have *manners He may proceed* [modorum procedeat], and the other codices, such as I Y together with edition 1, add *Holy* [sancto] to *in the Spirit* [in Spiritu].
[5] 1 Cor. 2:11. The Vulgate reads: For who of men knows, what (thoughts) belong to a man, except the spirit of the man, which is in him? — The Vatican edition, striving against the manuscripts and the six first editions, adds *any* [aliquo] after *are in* [sunt in], and a little below this after *Apostle (says)* [Apostolus] adds *and* [et]. Codex O exhibits the conclusion to argument thus: *therefore if He is a spirit, and the Spirit of both; and if this, Both are united in the Spirit.*
[6] Codex T has *for they who have not been separated*

plurimi codd. cum hac differentia, quod plures codd. pro *unicus* habent *unitus*, alii vero pauci *vivificus*. Probabilior nobis ob contextum visa est lectio codd. H I M in textum recepta.

[11] Codd. H Y *essentialem* et cod. Z *essentiae* loco *per essentiam*, quod multi codd. ut A C F G K L O R S T U V etc. cum sex primis edd. omitunt.

[12] Fide multorum mss. ut A F G H I K T V X etc. et ed. 1 substituimus *Et* pro *In*.

[qui enim non separate sunt].

[7] In the Vatican edition this is prefaced with an *either* [aut].

[8] Codex E has *the Same* [eodem] in the place of *One* [uno], which less well, the Vatican edition, in disagreement with all the other manuscripts and edition 1, omits.

[9] Very many codices, such as A C G K L S U V W Y faultily add here *of Him* [eius]. Then after *for that reason* [ideo] edition 1 adds *even* [et].

[10] The Vatican edition omits *He is* [est], by reading: *because mutual love is a unique and substantifying love* [quia amor mutuus est amor unicus et substantificus]; thus also the other editions and very many codices, with this difference, that very many codices have *united* [unitus] in place of *unique* [unicus], a few others have *vivifying* [vivificus]. More probable to us, on account of the context, appears the reading of codices H I and M, in the text here received.

[11] Codices H and Y have *essential* [essentialem] and codex A *of essence* [essentiae], which many codices, such as A D F G K L O R S T U V etc. together with the six first editions, omit.

[12] Trusting in many manuscripts, such as A F G H I K T V X etc. and edition 1, we have substituted *And* [Et] for *In* [in — Trans. note: which would have made the translation read: *A nexus in any of these manners happens to be*.]

---

p. 203

quo aliqui duo convenient; dicendum, quod est convenientiae *essentialis*, et est convenientia *originis*;[1] et nexus utroque modo potest esse; et quamvis Pater et Filius non conveniant *formaliter* in persona una, tamen *originaliter* conveniunt, quia una persona oritur ab utroque uno et eodem modo.

which some two convene; it must be said, that there is an *essential* convenience, and there is a convenience *of origin*,[1] and in each manner there can be a nexus; and although the Father and the Son do not convene *formally* in one Person, they do, however, convene *originally*, because one Person arises from each One and in the same manner.

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod Filius et Spiritus sanctus conveniunt in Patre; dicendum, quod convenientiae *originis* dicitur dupliciter: aut quia oriuntur ab uno, aut quia ab eis oritur unus. Si quia ab uno,[2] sic non dicitur nexus, quia nexus est unio *consequens* distinctionem, sed unitas in originie *antecedit* distinctionem. Si vero quia unius origo,[3] propriisime est nexus; et sic est in Patre et Filio respectu Spiritus sancti.

3. To that which is objected, that the Son and the Holy Spirit convene in the Father; it must be said, that a convenience of *origin* is said in a twofold manner: either because they arise from one, or because one arises from them. If because from one,[2] thus it is not said (to be) a nexus, because a nexus is a union *consequent* to distinction, but unity in origin *antecedes* distinction. But if because (they are) the origin of one,[3] most properly is there a nexus; and thus it is in the Father and the Son in respect to the Holy Spirit.

Aliter tamen potest dici, quod non est simile, quia Filius et Spiritus sanctus non

In another manner, however, it can be said, that it is not similar, because the Son and

eodem modo producuntur a Patre, sed Pater et Filius eodem modo spirant Spirtum sanctum. Et *iterum*, Patris et Filii convenientia est in Spiritu sancto ut in amore, cuius est nectere; sic non conveniunt Filius et Spirtus sanctus in Patre.

the Holy Spirit are not produced in the same manner from the Father, but the Father and the Son do in the same manner spirate the Holy Spirit. And *again*, there is a convenience of the Father and the Son in the Holy Spirit, as in love, to which it belongs to join; in this manner the Son and the Holy Spirit do convene in the Father.

4. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod nexus dicitur, aut quia nectit etc.; dicendum, quod *quaedam* sunt verba, quae in voce activa significant passionem, ut verba ad sensum pertinentia, ut video, audio et similia;[4] *quaedam* in voce activa significant actionem, ut facio et percutio, similiter in passiva. Dicendum igitur, quod hoc quod est *nectere*, cum nectere dicatur Spiritus, quia ab utroque procedit, recte in voce activa passionem significat et in passiva actionem; et ideo non significatur,[5] quod aliquid det Patri et Filio, sed quod magis recipiat.

4. To that which is objected, that one means a "nexus", either because it joins, etc.; it must be said, that there are *certain* words, which in the active voice signify a passion, as the words pertaining to sensing, such as "I see", "I hear" and the like;[4] *certain ones* in the active voice signify action, such as "I make" and "I strike", similarly in the passive (voice). Therefore it must be said, that this (word) which is "to join", when the Spirit is said to join, because He proceeds from Both, rightly signifies in the active voice a passion and in the passive an action; and for that reason does not signify,[5] that He gives something to the Father and to the Son, but that rather He receives.

SCHOLION.

Si Spiritus sanctus dicitur *nexus*, sensus est, quod est amor a duobus, scil. Patre et Filio, tanquam ab uno principio uniformiter productus. Cfr. solut. ad 2. Quoad ipsam conclusionem cfr. infra dub. 4. — Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 43. m. 3. a. 3. — S. Thom., hic a. 1. q. 3*; S. I. q. 37. a. 1. ad 3. — B. Albert., hic a. 8. 9. — Petr. a Tar., hic a. 3. q. 1. — Richard. a. Med., hic a. 2. q. 2. — Aegid. R., hic 1. princ. q. 3.

SCHOLIUM

If the Holy Spirit is said (to be) a nexus, the sense is, that He is the Love from both, namely, from the Father and the son, as One produces uniformly from one principle. Cf. solution to n. 2. In regard to that conclusion, cf. below, dubium 4. — Alexander of Hales, Summa, p. I, q. 43, m. 3, a. 3. — St. Thomas, here in a. 1. q. 3; Summa, I, q. 37, a. 1 ad 3. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in aa. 8 and 9. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in a. 3. q. 1. — Richard of Middletown, here in a. 2, q. 2. — Giles the Roman, here in 1. princ. q. 3.

* In textu criticalis perperam *q. 1. a. 3.* et post *Petr. a Tar.* habet *q. 3 a. 1*.
[1] Vat., adstipulante nullo cod., *originalis*, et mox contra antiquiores codd. et ed. 1 post *potest* addit *dici*, deinde contra multos codd. ut I K M R T Z etc. ac ed. 1 loco *conveniant* ponit *communicent*.
[2] Codd. L O hic addunt *sic Filius et Spiritus sanctus conveniunt originaliter in Patre, sed*.
[3] Ita plurimi codd. cum edd. 2, 3, sed Vat. *quia a duobus unius origo*; cod. R cum ed. 1 *quia unus oritur*; cod. X *quia unus oritur a duobus*.
[4] Ed. 1 *consimilia*, dein post *quaedam* adiungit *quae*.
[5] Cod. X *significat*, cod H *sequitur*.

[1] The Vatican edition, agreeing with no codex, has *an original convenience* [convenientia originalis], and then against the more ancient codices and edition 1, after *there can* [potest] adds *be said to* [dici], then against many codices, such as I K M R T Z etc. and edition 1, in place of *do not convene* [non conveniat] puts *do not communicate* [non communicent].
[2] Codices L and O here add *thus the Son and the Holy Spirit convene originally in the Father, but* [sic Filius et Spiritus sanctus convenient originaliter in Patre, sed].
[3] Thus very many codices together with editions 2 and 3, but the Vatican edition reads *because the origin of one (is) from two*; codex R together with edition 1 has *because one arises* [quia oritur]; codex X has *because one arises from two* [quia unus oritur a duobus].

[4] Edition 1 has *(words) entirely similar* [consimilia], and then after *certain ones* [quaedam] adds *which* [quau].
[5] Codex X has *it does not signify* [non significat], codex H *it does not follow* [non sequitur].

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM X.

ARTICULUS I.

Quaestio III.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 203-204.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION X

ARTICLE I

Question 3

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 203-204.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUAESTIO III.

Utrum Spiritus sanctus proprie sit spiritus.

Tertio et ultimo quaeritur, utrum Spiritus sanctus proprie sit spiritus. Et quod sic, videtur hoc modo:

1. Quia persona Spiritus sancti isto nomine propriissime designatur, quod dicitur Spiritus sanctus;[6] sed hoc nomen *sanctus* non coarctat hoc quod est *spiritus*, cum sit

QUESTION 3

Whether the Holy Spirit is properly a spirit.

Third and last it is asked, whether the Holy Spirit is properly a spirit. And that (it is) so, seems in this manner:

1. Because the Person of the Holy Spirit is designated most properly by this name of His, wherefore [quod] He is said (to be) "the Holy Spirit";[6] but this noun "*holy*" does not

aeque commune: ergo spiritus proprie dicitur illa persona.

constrain this (noun) which is "*spirit"*, since it is equally common: therefore that Person is properly said (to be) "the Spirit."

2. Item, Spiritus dicitur, quia[7] spiratur; sed quod spiratur non generatur, nec e converso: ergo cum *spirari* non conveniat Patri nec Filio: ergo convenit Spiritui sancto.

2. Likewise, He is said (to be) the Spirit, because[7] He is spirated; but what is spirated, is not generated, nor the other way around: therefore since *to be spirated* does not convene with the Father nor with the Son: therefore it convenes with the Holy Spirit.

3. Item, homines concordes in uno malo dicuntur *conspiratores*, non quia idem cogitent, sed quia idem malum appetunt, et ad idem malum unus omnium est colligatus affectus: ergo cum *conspiratio*[8] a *spiratione* veniat, non dicitur spirari nisi amor: ergo nec Spiritus sanctus dicitur nisi amor: ergo etc.

3. Likewise, men concordant [concordes] in one evil are said (to be) *conspirators*, not because they think the same, but because they desire the same evil, and because one affection, binding to the same evil, belongs to all: therefore since *conspiracy*[8] comes from *spiration*, naught is said to be spirated except love: therefore neither is the Holy Spirit said (to be) but Love: ergo etc..

Contra: 1. *Spiritus est Deus, et eos, qui adorant eum, in spiritu et veritate oportet adorare*, Ioannis quarto;[9] sed tota Trinitas est adoranda: ergo tota Trinitas est spiritus; hoc idem dicit Augustinus.[10]

On the contrary: 1. *God is a spirit, and those, who adore Him, must adore in spirit and truth*, (the Gospel of St.) John, (chapter) 4;[9] but the whole Trinity is to be adored: therefore the whole Trinity is a spirit; this same (thing) does (St.) Augustine say.[10]

2. Item, *ratione* ostenditur hoc idem sic: spiritus dividitur contra corpus: ergo quod non est corpus est spiritus:[11] ergo est nomen absolutum, non relativum: ergo etc.

2. Likewise, this same (argument) is shown *by reason* in this manner: "spirit" is divided against "body": therefore what is not a body is a spirit:[11] therefore it is an absolute noun, not a relative (one): therefore (it convenes with the whole Trinity).

3. Item, spiritus dicitur aut a *spiritualitate*, aut a *spiratione*. Si a *spiritualitate*, sic dividitur contra corpus, et constat quod toti[12] coveniat Trinitate; si a *spiratione*; contra: *spirare* active dictum . . .

3. Likewise, "spirit" is said either from *spirituality*, or from *spiration*. If from *spirituality*, thus it is divided against "body", and it is established that it convenes with the whole[12] Trinity; if from *spiration*; on the contrary: *to spirate* actively said . . .

---

[6] Unus alterve cod. ut Z cum ed. 1 omittit *sanctus*, pro quo cod. O ponit *quia per spirationem producitur*. Paulo ante cod. Z *quo* loco *quod*, pro quo aliqui codd. habent *quia*. Mox codd. aa bb post *non coarctat hoc* addunt *nomen* et ed. 1 post *ergo spiritus* adiicit *sanctus.*

[7] Fide multorum mss. ut A F G H I K M T V Y etc. substituimus *quia* loco *quod*.

[8] Praestamus lectionem veram ex multis mss. ut A F G H I K M S T W etc. et ed. 1 ponendo *conspiratio* loco *spiratio*.

[9] Vers. 24.

[10] Libr. V. de Trin. c. 11. n. 12, et ibid. XV. c. 19. n. 37. Vide hic lit. Magistri, c. 3. — Ed. 1 *hoc ipsum* loco *hoc idem*.

[11] In cod. O additur *sed tota Trinitas non est corpus, ergo* etc. In fine argumenti supple: ergo convenit toti Trinitati.

[12] Ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus non

[6] One or the other codex, such as Z, together with edtion 1 omits *Holy* [sanctus], in place of which phrase codex O puts *because He is produced through spiration* [quia per spirationem producitur]. A little before this codex Z has *by which* [quo] in place of *wherefore* [quod], in place of which some codices have *because* [quia]. Then codices aa and bb after *does not contrain this* [non coarctat hoc] add *noun* [nomen] and edition 1 adds *Holy* [sanctus] to *"the Spirit"*.

[7] Trusting in many manuscripts, such as A F G H I K M T V Y etc. we have substituted *because* [quia] in place of *because* [quod].

[8] We offer the true reading from many manuscripts, such as A F G H I K M S T W etc and editino 1, by putting *conspiracy* [conspiratio] in place of *spiration* [spiratio].

[9] Verse 24.

[10] On the Trinity, Bk. V, ch. 11, n. 12, and ibid., Bk.

bene omissum *toti*.

XV, ch. 19, n. 37. See here the text of Master (Peter), ch. 3. — Edition 1 has *this very (thing)* [hoc ipsum] in place of *this same (thing)*.
[11] In codex O there is added *but the whole Trinity is not a body, therefore* etc. [sed tota Trinitas non est corpus, ergo]. At the end of the argument supply: therefore it convenes with the whole Trinity.
[12] From the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1. we have supplied the not so well omitted *whole* [toti].

---

convenit toti Trinitati, quia tota Trintas dicitur inspirare: ergo active dictum non dicitur relative, ergo nec passive.

4. Item, secundum quod dicitur a *spiratione*, videtur quod magis proprie conveniat Filio; et hoc patet per auctoritatem, Iob trigesimo secundo:[1] *Inspiratio Omnipotentis dat intellectum*; sed hoc appropriatur Filio: ergo etc.

5. Item, spiratio est actus naturalis;[2] sed solus Filius procedit per modum naturae: ergo solus Filius spiratur.

CONCLUSIO.

Spiritus, quatenus dicitur a spiritualitate, convenit toti Trinitati; quatenus atuem dicitu ra spiratione, est proprium Spirtus sancti.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod hoc nomen *spiritus* reperitur in *corporibus*, in substantiis *rationalibus*[3] et in *Deo*; et licit in Deo sit propriissime, quia propriissime est in eo spiritualitas et spiratio, tamen ratio cognoscendi et dicendi tanquam a posteriori incipit a substantia corporali.

In substantia autem *corporali* spiritus dicitur dupliciter: aut a *spiritualitate* contra corpulentiam; et sic dicitur absolute, et vocatur spiritus *corpus subtile*, sicut accipitur in libro de Differentia spiritus et animae;[4] aut a *spiratione*; et sic dicitur spiritus *flatus*, sicut accipit Chrysostomus, Ioannis tertio:[5] *Spiritus ubi vult spirat* etc. Et in Psalmo:[6] *Ignis, grando, spiritus* etc.

convenes with the whole Trinity, because the whole Trinity is said to inspire: therefore actively said, it is not said relatively, therefore neither passively.

4. Likewise, according to which it is said from *spiration*, it seems that it more properly convenes with the Son; and this is clear through authority, Job (chapter) thirty-two:[1] *The inspiration of the Omnipotent gives understanding*; but this is appropriated to the Son: ergo etc..

5. Likewise, spiration is a natural act;[2] but the Son alone proceeds through a manner of nature: therefore the Son alone is spirated.

CONCLUSION

"Spirit", to the extent that it is said from spirituality, convenes with the whole Trinity; but to the extent that it is said from spiration, it is proper to the Holy Spirit.

I respond: It must be said, that this noun "spirit" is found in *bodies*, in *rational*[3] substances and in God; and though in God it be most proper, because most properly is there in Him spirituality and spiration, however the reckoning of cognizing and of speaking begins from corporal substance, as from the posterior.

Moreover in a *corporal* substance "spirit" is said in a twofold manner: either from *spirituality* (divided) against "corpulence"; and thus it is said absolutely, and "spirit" is called *a subtle body*, just as it is accepted in the book On the Difference of Spirit and Soul;[4] or from *spiration*; and thus "a spirit" is said (to be) "a breath", just as (St. John) Chrysostom accepts it, in the third (chapter of the Gospel of St.) John:[5] *The Spirit breathes where he will* etc. And in the

Secundum hunc duplicem modum accipitur in substantia *spirituali* sive rationali, aut a *spiritualitate* contra corporeitatem: et sic substantia rationalis vel eius potentia interior dicitur spiritus, Ecclesiastis tertio:[7] *Quis novit, si spiritus filiorum* etc.; aut a *spiratione*; et sic affectus vel amor dicitur spiritus. Et ratio huius est, quia actus spirationis in corpore est actus *internus*, actus *continuus*, actus *vivificus*, et habens originem a *calore*.[8] Quia igitur egressus amoris, ut amor est, venit ab *intrinseco*; et amor est actus *vivificus*, quia amor est vita; et iterum amor est actus *continuus*, quia continue debet reddi amor, et tunc est perfectus, quando homo sic amat; rursus est *calor* spiritualis: ideo solus amor dicitur spiritualiter spirari; et sic accipitur illud primae ad Thessalonicenses ultimo:[9] *Ut integer spiritus* etc.

Psalm:[6] *Fire, hail, spirit* etc..

According to this twofold manner it is accepted in a *spiritual* or rational substance, either from *spirituality* (divided) against *corporality*: and thus a rational substance and/or its interior power is said (to be) "a spirit", Ecclesiastes (chapter) three:[7] *Who knows, if the spirit of the children* etc.; or from *spiration*; and thus an affection and/or love is said (to be) "a spirit". And the reason for this is, that the act of spiration in a body is an *internal* act, a *continual* act, a *vivifying* act, and has [habens] its origin from *heat*.[8] Therefore because an egress of love, as love is, comes from *within*; and love is a *vivifying* act, because love is life; and against love is a *continual* act, because love ought to be continually returned, and then it is perfect, when a man loves in this manner; again it is a spiritual *heat*: for this reason love alone is said spiritually to be spirated; and thus is accepted that verse from the last (chapter of St. Paul's) First (Letter) to the Thessalonicans:[9] *That your whole spirit* etc..

Secundum hunc duplicem modum accipitur in *divinis*. Nam secundum quod spiritus dicitur a spiritualitate, sic convenit toti Trinitati; nam tota Trinitas caret corporeitate et materialitate; et sic est nomen absolutum, Ioannis quarto:[10] *Spiritus est Deus*. Secundum autem quod dicitur a spiratione, sic convenit illi soli personae, quae procedit[11] ut amor, ratione iam dicta. Spirari enim in spiritualibus solius est amoris; et quoniam amor potest spirari recte et ordinate, et sic est purus; vel indirecte et immunde, et sic est libidinosus: ideo persona illa, quae est amor, non tantum dicitur Spiritus, sed Spiritus sanctus. Non sic Filius dicitur[12] sanctus, quia generatio est motus naturalis, circa quem non attenditur sanctitas vel puritas, sicut attenditur circa amorem voluntatis.

According to this twofold manner it is accepted among *the divine*. For according to which "spirit" is said from spirituality, thus it convenes with the whole Trinity; for the whole Trinity lacks corporality and materiality; and thus it is an absolute noun, in the fourth (chapter of the Gospel of St.) John:[10] *God is a spirit*. But according to which it is said from spiration, it thus convenes that Person alone, who proceeds[11] as Love, for the reason already said. For "to be spirated" among spirituals belongs to love alone; and since love can be rightly and ordinately spirated, and thus is pure; and/or in an indirect and filthy manner, and thus is libidinous: for that reason that Person, who is Love, is not only said (to be) "the Spirit", but "the Holy Spirit". Not so is the Son said (to be) "Holy",[12] because generation is a natural movement, in which sanctity and/or purity is not involved [circa quem non attenditur], as it is involved in the love of the will.

1. 2. 3. 4. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod spirare est totius Trinitatis; dicendum, quod *spirare* dicitur dupliciter: *uno modo* est spirare idem quod Spiritum[13] producere; et sic non convenit toti Trinitati; *alio* modo est spirare idem quod inspirare; et sic[14]

1. 2. 3. 4. To that which is objected, that "spirating" belongs to the whole Trinity; it must be said, that *to spirate* is said in a twofold manner. *in one manner* "to spirate" is the same (thing) which "to produce the Spirit"[13] (is); and in this manner it does not

convenit toti Trinitate, quia inspirare dicit effectum spiritus, qui est a tota Trinitate. Dicitur enim inspirari quod in spiritu nostro spiritualiter immittitur, sive affectio sive cognitio.

convene the whole Trinity; *in another* manner "to spirate" is the same (thing) which "to inspire" (is); and in this manner[14] it convenes with the whole Trinity, because "to inspire" means "an effect of the spirit", which is from the whole Trinity. For one is said to be inspired because there is spiritually sent into our spirit, either an affection or the cognition (of something).

5. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod[15] motus est naturalis; dicendum, quod sic est in corporalibus, quae spirant propter naturae indigentiam; sed non sic in spiritualibus substantiis, quae spirant ex liberalitate voluntatis. Unde ratione huius non trasfertur,[16] sed ratione aliarum prorietatum.

5. To that which is objected, that[15] it is a natural movement; it must be said, that thus it is in corporeals, which pant [spirant] on account of the indigence of nature; but not so among spiritual substances, which sigh [spirant] out of the liberality of the will. Whence the reckoning of this is not transferred,[16] but by the reckoning of the other properties.

SCHOLION.

In conclusione antiqui Scholastici cum Patribus Latinis et Graecis consentiunt. Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 43. m. 1, et q. 63. m. 1. — Scot., I. Sent. d. 18. q. unica in utroque scripto. — S. Thom., hic a. 1. q. 4;* S. q. 36. a. 1. — B. Albert., hic a. 13; S. p. I. tr. 8. q. 36. m. 1. — Petr. a Tar., hic a. 3. q. 2. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 2. q. 3. — Aegid R., hic 1. princ. q. 4. — Henr. Gand., S. a. 61. q. 1. 2. — Durand., hic a. 1. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 2.

SCHOLIUM

In conclusion the ancient Scholastics agree with the Latin and Greek Fathers. Alexander of Hales, Summa, p. I. q. 43, m. 1, and q. 63, m. 1. — Scot., Sent., Bk. I, d. 18, q. sole, in either redaction. — St. Thomas, here in a. 1, q. 4; Summa., q. 36, a. 1. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 13; Summa., p. I, tr. 8, q. 36, m. 1. — Peter of Tarentaise, here in a. 3. q. 2. — Richard of Middletown, here in a. 2, q. 3. — Giles the Roman, here in 1. princ., q. 4. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 61, qq. 1 and 2. — Durandus, here in a. 1. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 2.

---

* Hic textus criticalis perperam *q. 1, a. 4* et etiam paulo infra post *Petr. a Tar.,* habet *hic q. 3, a. 2*.

[1] Vers. 8, in quo textu Vulgata cum ed. 1 habet *intelligentiam* loco *intellectum.* Mox ed. 1 *haec* pro *hoc*.

[2] Cfr. Aristot., de Respiratione.

[3] Substituimus ope multorum mss. ut A F G K T etc. et edd. 1, 2, 3 *rationalibus* loco *rationabilibius*.

[4] Liber iste a Richardo (hic a. 2. q. 3) attribuitur Constabulo; sed cfr. Biblioteca philosophorum mediae aetatis, ed. a Barach, Innsbruck 1876-1878, facisc. 2, ubi continentur: Excerpta Costa-Ben Lucae de Differentiae animae et spiritus. Vide etiam libr. de Spiritu, c. 1. (inter opera Arist.).

[5] Homil. 26 (alias 35.) super Ioan. 3, 8.

[6] 148, 8.

[7] Vers. 21.

[8] De his respirationis actibus vide Arist., de Respiratione; et Nemesium, de Natura hominis, ch. 28.

[9] Vers. 23.

[10] Vers. 24.

[11] Cod. K adiungit *per modum amoris vel*. Mox post *dicta* Vat. et cod. cc cum subnexis non cohaerenter

[1] Verse 8, in which text the Vulgate together with editin 1 has *intelligence* [intelligentiam] in place of *understanding* [intellectum]. Then edition 1 has *this (i. e. intelligence)* [haec] in place of *this (i. e. understanding)* [hoc].

[2] Cf. Aristotle, On Respiration.

[3] We have substituted with the help of many manuscripts, such as A F G K T etc. and editions 1, 2, 3 *rational* [rationalibus] in place of *reckonable* [rationabilibus].

[4] This book is attributed by Richard of Middletown (here in a. 2. q. 3) to Constabulus; but cf. Biblioteca philosphorum mediae aetatis, edited by Barach, Innsbruck, 1876-1878, facisculum 2, where it cites: Excerpts from Costa-Ben Luca's, De Differentiae animae et spiritus. See also the book On the Spirit, ch. 1 (among the works of Aristotle).

[5] Homily 26 (a.k.a. 36) on the Gospel of John 3:8.

[6] 148:8.

[7] Verse 21.

[8] On these actus of respiration see Aristotle, On Respiration; and Nemesius's, On the Nature of Man, ch. 28.

[9] Verse 23.

et praeter fidem aliorum codd. cum ed. 1 *Spirare* loco *Spirari*.

[12] Auctoritate mss. et sex primarum edd. expunximus hic perperam additum *Spiritus*.

[13] In mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3 non additur *sanctum*, quod in Vat. habetur.

[14] Vat. contra antiquiores mss. et. ed. 1 *ille* pro *sic*.

[15] Supple: spiratio. Paulo infra praeferimus lectionem plurimum codd. ut F P X Y et ed. 1 *spirant* loco *inspirant*.

[16] Vat. cum cod. cc *transferuntur*, sed falso, quia subiectum est spiratio, et contra vetustiores codd. et ed. 1. Cod. K addit satis bene *ad divina*.

[10] Verse 24.

[11] Codex K inserts *through a manner of love and/or* [per modum amoris vel]. Then after *said* [dicta] the Vatican edition and codex cc, not coherently with what is subjoined, and against the testimony of the other codices and edition 1, has *"to spirate"* in place of *"to be spirated"*.

[12] On the authority of the manuscripts and the six first editions we have expunged here the faultily added *Spirit* [Spiritus].

[13] In the manuscripts and in editions 1, 2 and 3, there is not added the *Holy* [sanctum], which is had in the Vatican edition.

[14] The Vatican edition, against the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, has *that* [ille] in place of *in this manner* [sic].

[15] Supply: spiration. A little below this we prefer the reading of the very many codices, such as F P X Y and edition 1, which have *sigh* [spirant] in place of *inspire* [inspirant]

[16] The Vatican edition together with codex cc has *are not transferred* [transferuntur], but falsely, because the subject is "spiration", and against the older codices and edition 1. Codex K adds, sufficiently well, *to the divine* [ad divina].

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM X.

DUBIA CIRCA LITTERAM MAGISTRI.

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION X

DOUBTS ON THE TEXT OF MASTER PETER

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S.**

Dub. I.

In ista parte sunt dubitationes circa litteram et primum de hoc quod dicit, quod *Spiritus sanctus est amor Patris sive caritas sive dilectio.* Quaeritur ergo, uturm caritas et dilectio differant; et quod sic, videtur per Isidorum[1] dicentem: *Amor* est rationalium et irrationalium, *dilectio* rationalium tantum. *Sed contra*: Dionysius de Divinis Nominibus, capite quarto:[2] « Mihi videntur Theologi commune quid dicere dilectionis et amoris nomine »: et ibidem[3] reprehendit distinguentes dicens, quod faciunt vim in levibus sonis, quasi nos non possimus quatuor per bis duo, et patriam per natale solum significare.

Doubt I

In this part there are doubts about the text (of Master Peter) and first concerning this which he says, that *the Holy Spirit is the love or charity or dilection of the Father*. Therefore it is asked, whether charity and dilection differ; and that they do [quod sic], seems through (St.) Isidore,[1] saying: *Love* [amor] belongs to rationals and irrationals, *dilection* only to rationals. *But on the contrary*: Dionysius (the Areopagite), On the Divine Names, chapter four:[2] « Theologians seem to me to say that [quid] with the common name of dilection and love »: and in the same place[3] he reprehends those distinguishing (the two), saying, that they fabricate a meaning among delicate sounds, as if we could not signify "four" through "twice two", and "fatherland" through "land of our birth" [per natale].

Respondeo: Aliqui voluerunt dicere, quod differunt, quia dilectio dicitur illa proprie, quae est ex voluntate ordinata, sed amor est affectio libidinosa. Sed haec distinctio est contra Dioniysium[4] et contra Augustinum super Ioannem[5] et contra canonem sacrae Scripturae, quia Dominus primo quaesivit a Petro: Simon Ioannis *diligis me?* et postea dixit: *amas me?* et ita pro eodem accipiuntur; et hanc differentiam[6] reprehendit Dionysius.

I respond: Some wanted to say, that they do differ, because that properly is said (to be) "dilection" , which is out of an ordinate will, but "love" [amor] is a libidinous affection. But this distinction is against Dionysius[4] and against (St.) Augustine (in his work) On the Gospel of John[5] and against the Canon of Sacred Scripture, because the Lord first asked from Peter: Simon (son) of John, *lovest thou Me?* [diligis me] and afterwards said: *lovest thou Me?* [amas me] and thus they are accepted for the same (idea); and Dionysius reprehends this difference.[6]

Potest tamen nihilominus aliqua differentia assignari. Quamvis enim de una et eadem possint dici affectione, tamen alia et alia ratione. *Amor* enim dicit affectionis adhaesionem respectu amati; unde Dionysius:[7] « Amorem unitivum dicimus ». *Dilectio* vero ultra hoc addit electionem; unde dilectio ex diversis electio; unde Canticorum quinto:[8] *Dilectus meus electus ex millibus*. *Caritas* autem ultra illa addit magnam appretiatioinem. Carum enim dicitur illud quod magni pretii aestimatur, secundum quod Apostolus in epistolis suis vocat *fideles carissimos*, primae ad

However, some difference can, nevertheless, be assigned. For although they can be said of one and the same affection, however for one reason and another. For *love* [amor] means the adhesion of affection in respect to the one loved; whence Dionysius (says):[7] « We mean "unitive love" [amorem unitivum] ». But *dilection* adds election to this; whence dilection is an election out of diverse (things); whence the fifth (chapter of the Canticle) of Canticles:[8] *My beloved, chosen out of a thousand* [Dilectus meus electus ex millibus]. Moreover *charity* adds a great

Corinthios quarto.[9]

appreciation to this. For (what is) "dear" [carum] is said (to be) that which is estimated (to be) of great price, according to that which the Apostle in his letters calls *dearly beloved faithful* [fideles carissimos], 1 Cor. 4.[9]

Dub. II.

Item dubitur de hoc quod dicit: *Proprie verbum Dei etiam Dei sapientia dicitur*; quia aut accipitur *proprie*, quia soli convenit, aut *proprie*, quia appropriate: quia si *soli*, hoc falsum est, quia *sapientia* nullo modo dicit prorpietatem personalem; si proprie, quia *appropriate*, hoc nihil facit ad propositum, quia Magister vult inquirere proprietatem Spiritus sancti, non appropriatum. *Et iterum*, caritas videtur magis appropriari Patri, secundum quod dicitur in illa prosa, « caritas Pater est »:[10] *Item*, hoc videtur per Richardum,[11] quia « amor gratuitus est in Patre, in Spiritu sancto debitus, in Filio ex utroque permixtus »: ergo cum caritas dicat amorem gratuitum, debet ergo apropriari Patri.

Doubt II

Likewise there is a doubt about this which he says: . . .*properly the Word of God is also said (to be) the Wisdom of God*, either because it is accepted *properly*, because it befits one alone, or *properly*, because it is appropriated: because if *to one alone*, this is false, because *wisdom* in no manner means a personal property; if properly, because *appropriated*, this does nothing for the proposed (argument), because Master (Peter) wants to inquire into the property of the Holy Spirit, not an appropriated (title). *And again*, charity seems to be appropriated more to the Father, according to which there is said in that phrase, « The Father is Charity »:[10] *Likewise*, the same [hoc] is seen through Richard (of St. Victor),[11] that « gratuitous love is in the Father, due (love) in the Holy Spirit, (love) thoroughly mixed out of each in the Son »: therefore since "charity" means "gratuitous love", it ought, therefore, be appropriated to the Father.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod non est omnimoda similitudo,[12] sed in hoc est similitudo: nam commune potest *appropriari*, manente unitate vocis vel significationis. Potest similiter aliquod nomen simul dici per *proprietatem* et per essentiam, manente unitate vocis et significationis,et tament est de se commune; et tale est hoc nomen caritas.

I respond: It must be said, that there is not a omnimodal similitude (between "wisdom" and "charity"),[12] but there is a similitude in this: for commonly ("charity") can *be appropriated*, by maintaining a unity of voice and/or of signification. Similarly any noun can be at the same time said as a [per] *property* and as an essence, by maintaining a unity of voice and of signification, and yet of itself it is common; and such is the noun "charity".

Aliter potest dici, quod *caritas* est commune et proprium et appropriatum; et Augustinus,[13] primo ostendit, quod est appropriatum per similitudinem ad *sapientiam*, et post ostendit, quod est vere[14] proprium, infra: *Nunc, quod incepimus ostendere* etc. Unde ex hac auctoritate non habetur, quod caritas sit proprium, sed solum quod appropriatum. Sed tamen ex aliis verbis Augustini habetur, quod caritas non solum est appropriatum, sed etiam proprie proprium Spiritus sancti.

In another manner it can be said, that *charity* is common and proper and appropriated; and (St.) Augustine,[13] first shows, that it is appropriated through a similitude to *wisdom*, and after shows, that it is truly[14] proper, below (where it is written): *Now, however, let us take up what we began to show,* etc.. Whence from this authority there is not had, that charity is proper, but only that it is appropriated. But yet from other words of (St.) Augustine there is had, that charity not only is appropriated, but also properly proper to

the Holy Spirit.

Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod caritas appropriatur Patri; dicendum, quod caritas habet duplicem . . .

To that which is objected, that charity is appropriated to the Father; it must be said, that “charity” has a twofold . . .

[1] Colligi potest ex his verbis VIII. Etymolog. c. 2: Omnis autem dilectio carnalis non dilectio, sed magis amor dici solet. Dilectionis autem nomen tantum in melioribus rebus accipi solet. Idem dicit I. Differentiarum, sub verbo amare et diligere: Alii dixerunt amare nobis naturaliter insitum, diligere vero ex electione.
[2] § 12.
[3] § 11.
[4] Loc. paulo supra cit.
[5] Tract. 123. n. 5, ubi in expositione horum verborum *Simon Ioannis, diligis me* etc. (Ioan. 24, 15-17) ait: Ubi etiam demonstratur unum atque idem esse amorem et dilectionem.
[6] Cod. dd *distinctionem*.
[7] De Div. Nom. c. 4. § 15. Vide hic a. 2. q. 2. fundam. 2. — In quo textu multi codd. cum sex primis edd. falso *mutuum* pro *unitivum*.
[8] Vers. 10.
[9] Vers. 14. et 17. — Plura de his vide infra d. 17. p. I. dub. 1. Consentiunt S. Thom. S. p. I. II. q. 26. a. 3; B. Albert., hic a. 2. Richard. et Petrus, hic circa lit.
[10] In officio Ss. Trinitatis. 1. Ant. 3. Nocturn. [“Caritas Pater est, gratia Filius, communicatio Spiritus Sanctus, o beata Trinitas.”]
[11] Libr. V. de Trin. c. 17. et seqq. Vide supra a. 1. q. 3. opp. 4. — Mox ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *quia* loco *quod*.
[12] Nempe inter *sapientiam* et *caritatem* quoad appropriationem et sensum proprii, prout patet paulo infra ex secunda solutione.
[13] Vide lit. Magistri, c. 2 et pro sequentibus c. 3.
[14] Fide mss. et ed. 1 adiecimus hic *vere*, et mox post *infra* expunximus *eadem distinctione*. Nonnulli codd. ut A G H I T etc. cum ed. 1 *vere proprie*, sed non ita congrue; cod. cc *vere et proprie*.

[1] Which can be gathered from these words taken from Etymologies, Bk. VIII, ch. 2: Moreover every carnal dilection is not dilection, but rather is accustomed to be called “love”. But the noun “dilection” is accustomed to be accepted only among better things. He says the same in Differences, Bk. I, under the verb “to love” [amare et diligere]: Some said that “to love” [amare] has been naturally placed in us, but “to love” [diligere] out of election.
[2] § 12.
[3] § 11.
[4] Loc. cit.
[5] Tract 123, n. 5, where in the exposition of these words *Simon son of John, lovest thou Me* etc. (Jn 24:15-17), he says: Where there is also demonstrated that love [amorem] and love [dilectionem] are one and the same.
[6] Codex dd reads *distinction* [distinctionem].
[7] On the Divine Names, Ch. 4, § 15. See a. 2, q. 2, fundament 2, of this distinction. — In which text many codices, together with the six first editions, falsely have *mutual* [mutuum] in place of *unitive* [unitivum].
[8] Verse 10.
[9] Verses 14 and 17. — See more on these terms, below in d. 17, p. I, dubium 1. St. Thomas, Summa, p. I II, q. 26, a. 3, Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 2, Richard (of St. Victor) and (Bl.) Peter (of Tarentaise), here on the text itself, agree.
[10] In the Officium Ss. Trinitatis, 1st. Antiphon for the 3rd Nocturne. [“The Father is Charity, the Son Grace, the Holy Spirit the Communication (of Both), o Blessed Trinity!”]
[11] On the Trinity, Bk. V, ch. 17 ff. See above, a. 1. q. 3, opp. 4. — Then from the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *that* [quia] in place of *that* [quod].
[12] Namely between *wisdom* and *charity* in regard to the appropriation and sense of the proper (term), insofar as it clear a little below from the second solution.
[13] See the text of Master (Peter), ch. 2, and for the following, ch. 3.
[14] Trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, we have inserted here *truly* [vere], and then after *below* [infra] we have expunged the *in the same distinction* [eadem distinctione]. Not a few codices, such as A G H I T etc., together with edition 1, have *truly properly* [vere proprie], but not so congruously; codex cc has *truly and properly* [vere et proprie].

p. 206

comparationem ad virtutes alias.

comparison to other virtues. For, it is

Comparatur, enim ut *mater*, ut dicit Ambrosius,[1] comparatur ut *vinculum*, ut dicit Apostolus ad Colossenses tertio:[2] *Caritas est vinculum perfectionis*. Ratione primi appropriatur Patri, ratione secundi Spiritui sancto.

compared as (their) *mother*, as (St.) Ambrose says,[1] it is compared as (their) *chain* [vinculum], as the Apostle (Paul) says to the Colossians, chapter three:[2] *Charity is the chain of perfection*. By the reckoning of the first it is appropriated to the Father, by the reckoning of the second to the Holy Spirit.

Ad illud quod obiicitur de Richardo, dicendum, quod *gratuitum* non dicit proprietatem amoris sive amandi, sed proprietatem personae, quae dat et non recepit.

To that which is objected concerning Richard, it must be said, that *gratuitous* does not mean a property of love or of loving, but a property of the person, who gives and does not receive.

Dub. III.

Doubt III

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit, quod *Spiritus sancti est dilectio, qua Pater et Filius se invicem et nos diligunt*. Quaeritur, utrum Pater et Filius diligant *nos* Spirtu sancto. Utrum enim diligant *se* Spiritus sancto, quaeretur[3] distinctione trigesima secunda, ubi istam quaestionem specialiter movet. Sed prima videtur omnino falsa et impropria. Cum enim dicitur: Pater et Filius diligunt nos etc., constat quod verbum *diligendi* tenetur essentialiter: ergo si diligant[4] Spiritu sancto, sunt Spiritus sanctus. Et *iterum*, dicit Augustinus,[5] quod haec nullo modo conceditur: Pater diligit se Spiritu sancto, quia diligere tenetur essentialiter: ergo similiter in proposito.

Is likewise asked of this which he says, that *the Holy Spirit is the dilection, by which the Father and the Son love* [diligunt] *love in turn themselves and us*. It is asked, whether the Father and the Son love [diligant] *us* with the Holy Spirit. For whether They love *Themselves* with the Holy Spirit, is asked[3] in the thirty-third distinction, where that question is especially moved. But the first seems entirely false and improper. For when it is said: 'The Father and the Son love us' etc., it is established that the verb for *loving* [diligendi] is held essentially: therefore if They love [diligant][4] with the Holy Spirit, They are the Holy Spirit. And *again*, (St.) Augustine says,[5] that this is in no manner conceded: 'The Father loves Himself with the Holy Spirit, because "to love" is held essentially': therefore similarly in the proposed.

Respondeo: *Quidam* dicunt, quod ablativus ille exponitur per hanc praeprositionem *per* cum accusativo, id est *per Spiritum sanctum*; et regula[6] est, quod haec praepositio *per* cum verbis transitivis dicit subauctoritatem, cum absolutis vero auctoritatem. Unde cum diligere sit transitivum, sensus est, quod Pater et Filius diligunt nos per Spiritum sanctum, quasi diceret: Pater operatur per Filium. — Sed haec expositio non videtur conveniens, quia similiter posset[7] dici: Pater et Filius puniunt sive odiunt nos Spiritu sancto; quod non vult dicere Augustinus.

I respond: *Certain ones* say, that that ablative is expounded through this preposition *per* with the accusative, that is *per Spiritum sanctum*; and the rule[6] is, that this preposition *per* with transitive verbs means a prepositional clause [subauctoritatem], however with intransitives [absolutis] an instrumental clause [auctoritatem]. Whence when "to love" [diligere] is transitive, the sense is, that the Father and the Son love us through the Holy Spirit, as if one were to say: 'The Father works through the Son'. — But this exposition does not seem fitting, because similarly there could[7] be said: 'The Father and the Son punish or hate us with the Holy Spirit'; which (is) not (what St.) Augustine wants to say.

Propterea notandum, quod *diligere* aliquando tenetur *pure essentialiter*, ut cum dicitur: Pater diligit se;[8] aliquando *pure notionaliter*, ut cum dicitur: Pater et Filius diligunt se Spiritu sancto, sicut patebit;[9] aliquando *partim essentialiter, partim notionaliter*, sicut cum dicitur: diligunt nos Spiritu sancto; et hoc[10] patet, quia idem est Patrem et Filium diligere nos Spiritu sancto, quod Spiritum sanctum nobis mittere sive inspirare. Mittere autem sive inspirare importat actum notionalem et essentialem, quia sensus est quod Spiritum producunt et donum eius nobis conferunt; unde dicit simul Spiritus sancti productionem et gratiae collationem. Et quamvis respectu actus essentialis non recipiatur habitudo ablativi, recipitur tamen ratione notionis, sicut et *hic*: Pater dicit se suo Verbo, dicit etiam creaturas Verbo; simili modo intelligendum est in proposito.

Moreover it must be noted, that *to love* [diligere] sometimes is held *in a purely essential manner* [pure essentialiter], as when there is said: 'The Father loves Himself';[8] other times *in a purely notional manner* [pure notionaliter], as when there is said: 'The Father and the Son love Themselves with the Holy Spirit', just as will be clear;[9] other times *partly in an essential manner, partly in a notional manner*, just as when there is said: 'They love us with the Holy Spirit'; and this[10] is clear, because 'that the Father and the Son love us with the Holy Spirit' is the same as 'that They send the Holy Spirit to us or to inspire us'. Moreover "to send" or "to inspire" conveys a notional and essential act, because the sense is that They produce the Spirit and confer the gift of Him on us; whence it means at once the production of the Holy Spirit and the conferral of grace. And although in respect to the essential act the habit of the ablative is not received, it is however received by a reckoning of its notion, just as (it is) *here*: 'The Father speaks Himself by His Word, He also speaks creatures by the Word'; in a similar manner it is to be understood in the proposed.

Dub. IV.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Sive enim sit unitas amborum sive sanctitas*; quid dicatur per hoc nomen *unitas*: quia aut unitas dicit unitatem *essentialem*, aut *notionalem*, aut *personalem*. Non essentialem, quia tunc non esset amborum, sed trium; non notionalem, quia Spiritus sanctus non est communis spiratio; non personalem, quia Pater et Filius non sunt unum in persona. *Item* quaeritur, quo modo haec[11] distinguantur, *unitas*, *sanctitas*, *caritas*.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod unitas *personaliter* tenetur. Sed attendendum, quod unitas aliquorum dicitur dupliciter: aut qua aliqui sunt unum, et sic Patris et Filii non est unitas *personalis*; aut qua aliqui sunt uniti, et sic Pater et Filius unica pesona uniuntur, sicut persona Spiritus sancti, quae est amor et vinculum nectens.[12]

Doubt IV

Is likewise asked of this which he says: *For whether He is the unity of both, or the sanctity*; what is said by this name *unity*? Because "unity" means either an *essential unity*, or a *notional one*, or a *personal one.* Not an essential one, because then it would not belong to Both, but to the Three; not a notional one, because the Holy Spirit is not the common "spiration"; not the personal one, because the Father and the Son are not one (thing) in a Person. *Likewise* it is asked, in which manner these[11] are distinguished, *unity, sanctity, charity*.

I respond: It must be said, that "unity" is held (here) *in the personal sense* [personaliter]. But it must be attended to, that a "unity" of anything is said in a twofold manner: either for the reason that some are one (thing), and thus to the Father and the Son does not belong a *personal* unity; or for the reason that some have been united, and thus the Father and the Son are united in a unique person, such as the Person of the Holy Spirit, who is the

Love and Chain binding (the Two).[12]

Ad illud quod quaeritur, quomodo differunt illa tria; dicendum, quod unum[13] addit supra alterum. Nam *unitas* dicit conditionem omnis amoris, quoniam omnis amor est vis unitiva; *sanctitas* dicit conditionem amoris casti contra libidinosum, qui non est purus; *caritas* dicit conditionem amoris praecipui; ideo enim caritas dicitur, quia est amor inaestimabiliter habens carum amatum.

To that which is asked, in what do those three differ? It must be said, that one[13] adds upon the other. For *unity* means a condition of every love, since every love is a unitive force; *sanctity* means a condition of chaste love (divided) against libidinous (love), which is not pure; *charity* means an outstanding [praecipui] condition of love; indeed [enim] for that reason He is said (to be) Charity, because He is Love having been dearly beloved in an inestimable manner [amor inaestimabiliter habens carum amatum].

Dub. V.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Si uterque non participatione, sed essentia sua . . . servantes unitatem spiritus*. Videtur enim non bene dicere, quia servare unitatem spirtus est producere Spiritum sanctum: ergo secundum hoc Pater et Filius sua essentia Spiritum sanctum producunt, et ita videtur . . .

Doubt V

Likewise is asked of this which he says: *not by participation, but by Their own Essence, . . . preserving the unity of spirit*. For it seems that he does not speak well, because to "preserve the unity of spirit" is to "produce the Holy Spirit": therefore according to this the Father and the Son produce the Holy Spirit with Their own Essence, and thus it seems . . .

---

[1] Comment. in I. Epist. ad Cor. c. 8, 2: Dum enim caritatem, quae mater omnium bonorum est, non sectatur, non sciunt, sicut oportet. Ceterum hic Comment. non est genuinus. De auctore (Ambrosiaster vulgo vocatur) vide d. XIX. c. 4, nota ad textum Magistri.

[2] Vers. 14.

[3] Vat. cum aliquibus codd. *quaeritur*. Paulo infra post *movet* unus alterve cod. ut I Z addit *Magister*.

[4] Ed. 1 *diligunt*. Mox cod. T *sunt Spiritu sancto* pro *sunt Spiritus sanctus*.

[5] Libr. XV. de Trin. c. 7. n. 12, et c. 17. n. 28.

[6] Cod. O *et ratio huius* loco *et regula*. Mox post *absolutis* ex antiquis mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *vero* pro *autem*.

[7] Vat. cum cod. cc, aliis autem codd. cum ed. 1 obnitentibus, *potest*.

[8] Codd. inter se non conveniunt; multi ut A F G H K S T X Y etc. cum ed. 1 exhibent lectionem nostram; Vat. cum cod. cc minus distincte *Pater et Filius diligunt se*; cod. I *Pater et Filius diligit se*.

[9] Dist. 32. a. 1. q. 1. et 2.

[10] Mendosa lectio Vat. *ex hoc* pro *hic*, et paulo infra *scilicet* loco *quod* castigatur ex mss. et ed. 1.

[11] Cod. dd *hic*. [Hic nota originaliter *Codd.*]

[12] Plura de hoc vide hic, a. 2. q. 2.

[13] Ed. 1 addit *istorum*.

[1] Commentary on the First Letter to the Corinthians, ch. 8, v. 2: For while charity, which is the mother of all good (things), is not eagerly followed, they do not know (the virtues), as one ought. The rest of the Commentary here is not genuine. Concerning (its) author — commonly called "Ambrosiaster" — see distinction XIX, ch. 4, note on the text of Master (Peter).

[2] Verse 14.

[3] The Vatican edition together with some of the codices has the indicative *is asked* [quaeritur]. A little below this before *moves* [movet], one or the other codex, such as I and Z, add *Master (Peter)*.

[4] Edition 1 has the indicative *they love* [diligunt]. then codex T reads *They are by the Holy Spirit* [sunt Spiritu sancto] for *They are the Holy Spirit* [sunt Spiritus sanctus].

[5] On the Trinity, Bk. IV, ch. 7, n. 12, and ch. 17, n. 28.

[6] Codex O has *and the reason for this* [et ratio huius] in place of *and the rule* [et regula]. Then after *intransitives* [absolutis] from the ancient manuscripts and edition 1 we have substituted *however* [vero] for *but* [autem].

[7] The Vatican edition together with codex cc, but with the other codices together with edition 1 objecting, has *it can* [potest].

[8] The codices do not agree amongst themselves; many, such as A F G H K S T X Y etc., together with edition 1, exhibit our reading; the Vatican edition together with codex cc has less distinctly *the Father and the Son love Themselves* [Pater et Filius diligunt se]; codex I has *the Father and the Son loves Themselves* [Pater et Filius diligit se].

[9] Distinction 32, a. 1, qq. 1 and 2.
[10] The faulty reading of the Vatican edition, which has *from this it* [ex hoc] for *this* [hic], and the little below *namely* [scilicet] in place of *that* [quod], are corrected from the manuscripts and edition 1.
[11] Codex dd has *here are these* [hic] in place of *these* [haec].
[12] For more on this see a. 2, q. 2 of this distinction.
[13] Edition 1 adds *of Them* [istorum].

---

p. 207

essentia[1] spirare. *Item* videtur etiam falsum quod dicitur, *non participatione*, quia Pater et Filius participatione spirationis[2] servant unitatem.

that They spirate with (Their) Essence.[1] *Likewise* what is said also seems (to be) false, *not by participation*, because the Father and the Son by sharing in the spiration [participatione spirationis][2] preserve unity.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod Augustinus[3] vult ostendere, duplicem modum unitatis esse inter Patrem et Filium, qui est inter membra Christi, scilicet *naturae* et *voluntatis*; sed differenter, quia in nobis est unitas *naturae* per participationem unius communis essentiae, sed non sumus ipsa essentia.[4] Pater vero et Filius non participant essentiam quasi diversum, immo sunt ipsa essentia. Similiter in nobis est conformitas *voluntatis* per donum Dei, quod unit nos; sed Pater et Filius uniuntur non dono accepto ab alio, sed Spiritu proprio; et sic patet responsio.[5]

I respond: It must be said, that (St.) Augustine[3] wants to show, that there is a twofold manner of unity among the Father and the Son, which is (also) among the members of Christ, namely (that) *of nature* and *of will*; but differently, because in us there is a unity *of nature* through a sharing in one common essence [per participationem unius communis essentiae], but we are not the essence itself.[4] However the Father and the Son do not share the Essence as (something) diverse, nay they are the Essence Itself. Similarly among us there is a conformity *of will* through a gift of God, which unites us; but the Father and the Son are united not by having received a gift from another, but by Their own Spirit; and this is clear the response.[5]

Dub. VI.

Doubt VI

Item quaeritur de ratione Augustini: *Quia enim communis est ambobus, id vocatur ipse proprie, quod ambo communiter*; ergo secundum hoc pari ratione Spiritus sanctus dicitur Deus proprie, cum Deus sit commune ambobus.

Likewise is asked concerning the reckoning of (St.) Augustine: *For He who is common to Them both, is Himself called properly, that which Both (are) commonly*; therefore according to this, for an equal reason, the Holy Spirit is said (to be) God properly, since (the noun) "God" is common to Both.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod aequivocatio est in *communitate*. Nam Augustinus non vocat *commune* quod est *in pluribus* et *de pluribus*, sed quod *a pluribus*; et ita commune dicitur magis a *communione*, quam a *communitate*, ut fiat vis in verbo, sicut fit inter unionem et unitatem. Et quoniam caritas non tantum dicit

I respond: It must be said, that there is an equivocation in (the term) *community*. For (St.) Augustine does not call *common* what is *among more* and *concerns more*, but what (is) *from more*; and thus (what is) "common" is said rather from *communion*, than from *community*, so that the meaning is derived from the verb [ut fiat vis in

communitatem, quia in pluribus, sed *communionem* per unitatem[6] distinctorum: ideo quamvis dicatur essentialiter, potest tamen nihilominus dici personaliter.

verbo], just as happens [fit] among "union" and "unity". And since "charity" does not only mean *community*, because (this is) among more, but (also) *communion* through the unity[6] of (things) distinct: for that reason although it is said essentially, nevertheless it can yet be said personally.

[1] Fide antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *essentia* loco *essentialiter*.
[2] Pauci codd. ut K V X *Spiritus sancti* pro *spirationis*.
[3] Verba Augustini vide in lit. Magistri, c. 2. circa finem.
[4] Codd. L O addunt *nisi cum aliquo addito*, et mox bene ponunt *vero* pro *enim*, quod edd. et plurimi codd. habent.
[5] Codd. V X *illud* loco *responsio*.
[6] Codd. H M N *connexionem* pro *unitatem*; cod. Y *per unionem et connexionem*; cod. cc *sed communitatem per unionem*. Paulo infra fide antiquiorum mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3, 6 adiecimus *tamen*.

[1] Trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *with (Their) Essence* [essentia] in place of *essentially* [essentialiter].
[2] A few codices, such as K V X, read *in the Holy Spirit* [Spiritus sancti] in place of *in the spiration* [spirationis].
[3] See the words of (St.) Augustine in the text of Master (Peter), ch. 2, near the end.
[4] Codices L and O add *but with something added* [nis cum aliquot addito], and then rightly put *However* [vero] in place of the *For* [enim], which the editions and very many codices have.
[5] Codices V and X have *that (argument)* [illud] in place of *response* [responsio].
[6] Codices H M and N have *connection* [connexionem] in place of *unity* [unitatem]; codex Y has *through union and connection* [per unionem et connexionem]; cod. cc has *but community through union* [sed communitatem per unionem]. A little before this, trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and editions 1, 2, 3 and 6, we have inserted *yet* [tamen].

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.